# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 202 EA 002 322

By-Fox, David J.; And Others

More Effective Schools Program: Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City 1967-68.

Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.; New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Report No-A-097, ESEA-T-1; P-0368

Pub Date Dec 68

Note-165p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.35

Descriptors-*Administrative Organization, Arithmetic, Decision Making, Educational Facilities, *Effective Teaching, Elementary Schools, Environmental Influences, Instructional Staff, Parent Attitudes, *Program Evaluation, Reading Achievement, Role Perception, *School Community Relationship, Self Concept, Tables (Data), *Urban Schools, Verbal Ability

Identifiers-ESEA Title 1, MES, *More Effective Schools Program, New York City

This report presents the 1967-68 evaluation of New York City's More Effective Schools (MES) project. The evaluation describes the facilities and staff provided by ESEA Title I funds and estimates the effectiveness of the MES schools by comparing them with control schools and special services (SS) schools. Estimates are provided of the impact of the project on children in the areas of reading achievement, achievement in arithmetic, verbal fluency, self-perception, and control of environment. Next, the evaluation sought information from teachers on aspects of role perception and decision making and ended by surveying parent opinion of the program. The sample used involves 30 schools: 16 MES schools, 7 control schools, and 7 SS schools. The study is based on a simple comparative survey design using 15 different data gathering instruments ranging from questionnaires to standardized tests. Data collection activities conducted in MES schools were replicated in control and SS schools by the same staff to insure consistency of results. (TT)

ED0 30202

OE-BESE
TITLE I
A 097

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1967-68

Project No. 0368

# MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

by David J. Fox, Lorraine Flaum,
Frederick Hill, Jr., Valerie Barns
and Norman Shapiro

December 1968

EA 002 322

The Center for Urban Education

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

David J. Fox, Lorraine Flaum,
Frederick Hill, Jr., Valerie Barnes, and Norman Shapiro

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1967-68 school year.

Educational Research Committee

December 1968

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The several facets of this evaluation of the More Effective Schools program during 1967-68 were supervised by different members of the staff. The Evaluation Chairman had overall supervisory responsibility, including the design of the study and the preparation of this final report. Lorraine Flaum supervised the in-class observations phase, and the oral reading task, including the analysis of these data and the preparation of the draft of the chapters based on them. Frederick Hill, Jr. was in charge of the surveys of teacher and parent opinion, from the development of the instruments through data collection and analysis and the draft of the chapter, and Valerie Barnes had similar responsibility for the study of in-class activities. Norman Shapiro was responsible for the study of verbal fluency, working with the Evaluation Chairman on the revision of the instruments and supervising the testing sessions in schools, and Bert Diament supervised the analysis of these data.

David J. Fox
Evaluation Chairman

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Topic | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I | Introduction | 1 |
| II | Procedure | 4 |
| III | Implementation of the MES Program | 16 |
| IV | School Functioning: Elementary Grades | 28 |
| V | Teacher and Pupil Functioning in Class: Elementary Grades | 33 |
| VI | Pupil Academic Functioning: Elementary Grades | 40 |
| VII | Children's Self-Perceptions | 60 |
| VIII | The MES Program in the Early Childhood Grades | 69 |
| IX | In-Class Activities in Third and Fifth Grades | 83 |
| X | Parent Opinion of the MES Program and Teacher Perception of Roles and Decision-Making | 100 |
| XI | Conclusions | 107 |
| APPENDIX A: | Tables | A1 |
| APPENDIX B: | Instruments | B1 |
| APPENDIX C: | Staff List | C1 |

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of the 1967-68 More Effective Schools program was conducted by the Center for Urban Education for the New York City Board of Education under funds made available under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This program, hereafter referred to as the MES program, has been under way in New York City since September of 1964, when it began in 10 schools. In September of 1965 an additional 11 schools were added to the program. These 21 schools have continued as ME schools during the school years beginning in September 1966 and 1967, with no additional schools added to the program.[1] As most readers of this report will remember, the expansion of the More Effective Schools program was one of the major points of difference in the dispute between the United Federation of Teachers and the New York City Board of Education during the summer and fall of 1967. The terms of the settlement of that dispute called for no expansion of the program for the academic year 1967-68, but also ruled out curtailment of the program in the academic year of 1968-69. In addition, the settlement called for the establishment of a Committee to recommend ways in which an earmarked fund of $10,000,000 could most effectively be spent on special programs at the elementary school level. That Committee had also studied the MES program, among other programs, and had issued its own report.[2] The reader is alerted to the fact that this current report bears no relationship to the work of the Committee, and is based on the completely independent evaluation study conducted for the purposes of the annual evaluation of projects financed under Title I funds.

The More Effective Schools program was originally detailed in a Report to the Superintendent of Schools from a Joint Planning Committee established by then Superintendent of Schools Calvin Gross.[3] This Committee, charged with the responsibility "for setting up a program for more effective schools,"[4] recommended a multifaceted program involving basic changes in four areas, "pupils and curriculum. . . personnel. . . school plant and organization. . . (and) community relations."[5] Within these areas, the report went on to detail twenty statements to guide policy in establishing the program, involving such specifics as selecting participating schools to maximize the likelihood of integration, setting a maximum class size of 22, providing teacher specialists, grouping classes heterogeneously, instituting team teaching, and emphasizing school-community relationships.

---

[1] These 21 schools have continued as the ME schools for the 1968 school year.

[2] Final Report, Committee on Experimental Program to Improve Educational Achievements in Special Service Schools, June 20, 1968, New York City Public Schools.

[3] Report of the Joint Planning Committee for More Effective Schools to the Superintendent of Schools, May 15, 1964, New York City Public Schools.

[4] *Ibid*, p.i.

[5] *Ibid*, p.ii, iii.

As noted earlier, the More Effective Schools program was first established in September 1964, in ten schools. These schools, therefore, have had the MES program for four full academic years and will be referred to in this report as the "Old" ME schools. The 11 schools added to the program in September of 1965, and in which it has been in existence for three years, will be referred to as the "New" ME schools.

## The Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program

In the history of educational programs there may well be none which has ever been evaluated to the same extent as the MES program. In the period since September 1964 through June of 1968, covering four academic years, this is the sixth formal evaluation of the program. In October 1965, the administrative staff of the program prepared a memorandum[6] to the Superintendent of Schools reporting on the first year of the MES program. In August 1966, the Center for Urban Education reported the results of a limited evaluation it conducted at the conclusion of the 1965-66 school year.[7] In September 1966, the Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education reported the results of its evaluation of the MES program for this same 1965-66 school year.[8] In September of 1967, the Center for Urban Education issued an evaluation of the program covering the 1966-67 school year,[9] and then in April of 1968, the Bureau of Educational Research issued a report covering the same period,[10] but evaluating only progress in reading for those children who had been enrolled in the MES program either since October 1964 (in the old ME schools) or since October 1965 (in either the old or the new ME schools).

The formal evaluation of the MES program has been characterized by controversy as well as by a mass of evaluations. The controversies have been of all possible types. In one evaluation,[11] the professional staff disagreed among themselves sufficiently for the report to be issued with a minority dissent included. The professional staffs of different evaluations have also disagreed with each other, for the April 1968 report of the Bureau of Educational Research specifically takes issue with the conclusions drawn in the area of reading achievement by the Center for Urban Education evaluation of the program during the 1966-67 school year. And finally, proponents of the program have disagreed with aspects of the evaluations and with the actions taken by the Board of Education involving the MES program, which they have attributed to the evaluations. This particular controversy was most completely summarized in the April 1968 issue of The Urban Review,[12] which published a special supplement containing two critiques of the Center for Urban Education evaluation and the response of the evaluation director.

---

[6] Memorandum on the first year of the More Effective Schools Program 1964-5 to Superintendent of Schools, New York City Board of Education, October 1965.

[7] The More Effective Schools Program, Center for Urban Education, New York, August 31, 1966.

[8] Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program Summary Report, Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, September 1966.

[9] Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program, Center for Urban Education, September 1967.

[10] Measuring Pupil Growth in Reading in the More Effective Schools, Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, April 1968.

[11] The More Effective Schools Program, Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966.

In addition to the controversy surrounding these specific formal evaluations of the program, journals and newspapers have had several articles in which informal and personal appraisals of the MES concept as well as the program have been stated, attacked, and defended.[13] To this evaluation team, the history of controversy in the efforts to evaluate the More Effective Schools program reflects three things. First, it reflects the strength of feeling that many people have about the program and their belief that it is one possible answer to the troubles besetting the urban public schools, particularly those located in so-called ghetto areas. Second, it reflects the fact that the data of educational research almost inevitably have sufficient ambiguity for alternate interpretations to be possible, so sincere people can see different conclusions in the same numbers. Third, it reflects the fact that to some people the MES program is so much a part of their belief system that they have little tolerance for any negative findings or comments about the program.

While we have no reason to believe that we can reach people referred to in this third point, we have considered the first two points in our planning of this evaluation and the preparation of this report. We met during the year with persons closely identified with the MES program in an effort to identify criteria that they felt should be considered in a balanced evaluation of the program, and added to our plans for data collection some of the specific suggestions made at these meetings.[14] In the preparation of this report we have tried to present the data in sufficient detail to permit any reader to draw his own conclusions and make his own interpretations. Similarly, in the text of the report we have tried to distinguish between what would be considered the purely descriptive aspects of research writing, and the evaluative aspects of research writing.

---

[12] The Urban Review, April 1968.

[13] The most widely circulated of these exchanges were three articles in the New Republic, the first by Joseph Alsop advocating the MES program, the second by Thomas Pettigrew and Robert Schwartz, taking issue with Mr. Alsop, and the third, Mr. Alsop's rejoinder. These were later published as a paperback book.

[14] It should be made clear here at the beginning of this report that the meetings were only intended to yield suggestions for criteria. The ways in which the criteria were operationally defined and the data collected and analyzed were completely the responsibility of the evaluation team. Those with whom we met are under no obligation to agree with our application of their suggestions or our interpretation of the data.

# CHAPTER II

# PROCEDURE

## OVERVIEW

The 1967-68 evaluation of the MES program had five major foci: First, the evaluation was designed to summarize the facilities and staff provided by Title I funds and to bring up to date the extent of implementation of the specific recommendations made in the Planning Committee Report. This aspect of the MES program was last studied in the 1966 report of the Bureau of Educational Research.[1]

Second, the evaluation was intended to estimate the effectiveness of the functioning of the ME schools in 1967-68, by comparing evaluative ratings and a survey of activities obtained for these schools to three kinds of data: 1) data obtained in the same schools in 1966-67; 2) data obtained in the officially designated "Control" schools for the MES program; and 3) data obtained in a sample of Special Service schools selected by evaluation staff.

Third, the evaluation was designed to provide estimates of the impact of the program on children in five areas: 1) achievement in reading on both formal standardized tests and informal textbook reading tests; 2) achievement in arithmetic on standardized tests; 3) verbal fluency on measures of the child's ability to understand and to speak fluent English; and both 4) self-perception and 5) control of environment, on a self-appraisal inventory. Fourth, the evaluation sought information from teachers on aspects of role perception and decision-making; and fifth, it sought to survey parent opinion of the program in the child's ME or non-ME school.

## THE SAMPLE AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The basic sample for this evaluation involved 30 schools: the 16 (of 21) ME schools which were funded under Title I; 7 Control (C) schools which had been paired with 7 of the ME schools by the Bureau of Educational Research in 1965-66, using ethnic composition as the variable for pairing; and 7 Special Service (SS) schools paired by evaluation staff with the 7 ME schools for which no control school had been designated, using both ethnic composition and neighborhood as the variables for pairing.[2] The other 5 ME schools are included only within the data presented on standardized tests of reading and arithmetic when making comparisons with previous years.

---

[1] Bureau of Educational Research, 1966, op.cit.

[2] Nine schools had been originally designated as Control Schools. But in 1966-67 one principal declined to participate in these evaluations. Another control school is paired with a school not among the 16 funded under Title I. Of the two ME schools not paired with a Control or Special Service school, one has only early childhood grades, and there was no comparable school to pair with the other.

Within schools, different grades were studied for various aspects of the study. In-class observations were conducted across all grades, from prekindergarten to fifth or sixth grade, whichever was the highest grade in the school. Data from standardized tests of reading are available from, and will be presented for, grades two through six. Data from standardized tests in arithmetic are available from and will be presented for grades three, four, and six. The informal textbook reading test and the tests of verbal fluency were administered in grade three, and the self-appraisal inventory in grade five. Parents invited to share their opinions with us were all the parents of children in grades three and five, while all teachers and specialists in each school were invited to participate in the role and decision-making study. Further sampling was done within grades for the separate phases of the study, and this sampling will be discussed with each phase later in this chapter.

## Design

The design of the study was a simple comparative survey design, in which all data collection activities conducted in the ME schools were replicated in the Control and Special Service schools. Not only were these activities replicated, but the same staff was used for all data collection in the three different settings.

Figure 1 describes the five major foci of the evaluation, listing the instruments used, the data collectors, and the grades involved in each aspect. As can be seen within the Figure, the five foci of the study involved 15 different instruments, 6 administered or completed by school staff and 9 completed or administered by members of the evaluation team.

## INSTRUMENTS

### The Facilities Questionnaire (Instrument 1)

To estimate the extent to which the ME schools have used their facilities in ways suggested by the proposal that established the program, and the extent to which they have received supplies and staff as allocated in the 1967-68 ESEA Title I proposal, a questionnaire was developed and sent to all 16 participating ME schools. This questionnaire asked the principal or his representative to indicate the kinds of facilities and services the school provided to the school under Title I funding.

### The Activity Study Instruments (Instruments 2 and 3)

The Activity Study was initiated to determine, by means of a day-long observation, which activities occurred in a sample of ME, C, and SS classes. To that end, two observation instruments were constructed, copies of which are found in the Appendix.

Activity Description Form. The primary observation form was designed to record the type of ongoing activities; the teachers present in the classroom; any evidence of departmentalization; the number of levels of instruction; the type of group of children present in the room and the

## FIGURE 1

## ASPECTS OF EVALUATION BY INSTRUMENT, DATA COLLECTOR, AND GRADE(S) INVOLVED

| Focus and Aspect | Instrument Used | Instrument Completed by or Administered by | Grades Covered |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. Implementation of Program | 1. Facilities Questionnaire | School Administrative Staff | Pre-K through 6 |
| | 2. Activity Description Form | Observational Team of Graduate Students in Psychology and Education (OTGS) | 3 and 5 |
| | 3. Classroom Interruption Schedule | OTGS | 3 and 5 |
| II. Effectiveness of Functioning | 4. General School Report (GSR) | Observational Team of Educators (OTE) | Pre-K through 6 |
| | 5. Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR) | OTE | Pre-K through 6 |
| III. Impact on Children<br>a. Reading | 6. Subtest in Reading (MAT) | Classroom Teachers | 2 through 6 |
| | 7. Oral Reading Task | OTE | 3 |
| b. Arithmetic | 8. Subtest in Problem Solving and Concepts (MAT) | Classroom Teachers | 3 |
| | 9. Subtest in Problem Solving of Iowa Basic Skills | Classroom Teachers | 4 and 6 |

FIGURE 1 (Continued)

ASPECTS OF EVALUATION BY INSTRUMENT, DATA COLLECTOR AND GRADE(S) INVOLVED

| Focus and Aspect | Instrument Used | Instrument Completed by or Administered by | Grades Covered |
|---|---|---|---|
| III. Impact on Children (Continued) | | | |
| c. Verbal Fluency | 10. Understanding of Spoken English (USE) | Testing Team of Graduate Students (TTGS) | 3 |
| | 11. Ability to Speak English | TTGS | 3 |
| d. Self Perception | 12. Self Perception Inventory | Field Team of Parents | 5 |
| e. Control of Environment | Self Perception Inventory | Field Team of Parents | 5 |
| IV. Teacher's Perceptions of Roles and Decision-Making | 13. Role Description Questionnaire | Teachers, Specialists, and Administrators | Pre-K through 6 |
| | 14. Decision-Making Inventory | Teachers, Specialists, and Administrators | Pre-K through 6 |
| V. Parent's Opinions | 15. Parent Questionnaire | Field Team of Parents | 3 and 5 |

supervisor of the activities. All possible entries for each of the above categories were coded so that all notations on the observational form followed the code enumerated on an accompanying code sheet.

Classroom Interruption Schedule. Entries on the second observational instrument consisted of a numerical account of persons, i.e., children and staff, entering and leaving the classroom. Therefore, with the exception of bathroom visits and "drinks of water," every departure from and entry to the room was recorded consecutively throughout the day. Whenever possible, the destination of the departure or the reason for the entrance was determined.

During the actual school visit, the observer always remained with the entire class and travelled with it for extra-classroom activities. In situations where the class was split into more than one group, the observer remained with the majority of the children, so that he was always able to record, by direct observation, what the majority of children were doing.

Prior to the use of the forms in the actual observations, a team of several ME evaluation staff members completed a pilot test of the two observation forms in two ME schools not included in the 1967-68 study. Independent observations were done and observer agreement was high. Therefore, only slight modifications were necessary for the instruments, and no further pilot testing was done. All observers were trained in the use of the instruments prior to being sent to observe.

Selection and training of observers. Because of the nature of the Activity Study observations, which involved detailed and almost continual recordings, observers were selected on the basis of previous elementary school teaching experience and/or observational experience. Therefore, all of the 11 observers were either former teachers or graduate students attending the City College Graduate School of Education.

Prior to the beginning of the study, an afternoon training session was held to familiarize and train the observers with the instruments. Following each observer's first school visit, an individual and extensive review of his observation was conducted.

Selection of classes. It was decided that two third- and two fifth-grade classes in each school would be observed. The project coordinator randomly selected from the school organization sheets one class at each of the two grade levels, while the principals of each school chose the remaining two classes to be observed, after being informed of the classes we had selected. Thus, usually four classes in each school were visited on the same day, with one observer per class. In ME schools, 26 third-grade and 26 fifth-grade classes were seen; 13 third-grade and 12 fifth-grade classes in the Control schools were visited; and 13 third-grade and 13 fifth-grade classes in the SS schools were observed, for a total of 103 classroom observations.

Principals were notified concerning the observation approximately five days in advance. Subsequent to the selection of the classes, each of the teachers involved was sent a letter from the Evaluation Chairman describing the purpose and nature of the observation. (A copy of this letter can be found in the Appendix.) Since the observer followed the class for the entire day, all efforts were made to reduce interference with the routine of the class and inconvenience to teachers and so observers were instructed to remain as discrete from the class as possible.

The General School Report (GSR) (Instrument 4)

The General School report[3] was a structured observation guide completed by the observers at the end of the day in school. It had specific rating scales, and from these, data were developed for the evaluation of overall school functioning.

The Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR)(Instrument 5)

This instrument was completed by the observers and is a simple structured observation guide which provides the observer with the dimensions of the classroom and lesson to be observed and asks the observer to rate each dimension, typically along a five-point scale ranging from "outstanding" to "poor" through a midpoint of "average."[4] Each ILOR was completed at the end of a classroom observation of approximately 45 minutes. The data from the ILOR provide the basis for the evaluation of teacher and pupil in-class functioning, and contribute to the data base for the analysis of overall school functioning.

The ILOR was adjusted for the early childhood grades to meet the relatively unstructured form on instruction. It was divided into two parts. The first section dealt with the overall pupil and teacher functioning and the second rated each activity observed during the visit. Table 1 shows number of classes observed.

Classroom and school observations were conducted by 23 educators selected from the faculties of several local colleges and universities and independent private schools. Those who visited the prekindergarten through first-grade classes were early childhood specialists. All the observers had current active contact with urban school systems, particularly that of New York City. Since it was determined in the MES study of 1966-67 that there was no qualitative difference in the evaluations conducted by educators or social scientists, no distinction was made between the two types in this report.

The observations were conducted by a team of two educators. The same observers were used throughout the evaluation study period, thus enabling them to visit an ME school and its control. An orientation session was held for all observers prior to the first school visits. At this time the purpose of the study was explained and the instruments to be used were distributed and reviewed. There was continuous communication with the observers throughout the study by both personal visits and a specially installed telephone line. This minimized the necessity of their making on-the-spot decisions and enabled the project staff to benefit from the observers' on site suggestions.

---

[3] This instrument is discussed at length in the 1967 MES evaluation of The Center for Urban Education.

[4] A complete discussion of the content and technical characteristics of the ILOR appears in the 1967 MES evaluation of The Center for Urban Education.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF CLASSES OBSERVED
BY GRADE AND SCHOOL TYPE
FOR EVALUATION OF IN-CLASS INSTRUCTION

| | School Type | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | ME | Control | Special Service |
| Pre-K | 32 | 7 | 8 |
| K | 32 | 17 | 16 |
| 1 | 32 | 17 | 17 |
| Total Early Childhood | 96 | 41 | 41 |
| 2 | 20 | 11 | 8 |
| 3 | 19 | 9 | 9 |
| 4 | 18 | 8 | 10 |
| 5 | 19 | 9 | 10 |
| 6 | 13 | 4 | 5 |
| Total Elementary | 89 | 41 | 42 |
| All Grades | 185 | 82 | 83 |

Instrument 6 is the subtest in Reading of the M.A.T. battery.

The Oral Reading Task (Instrument 7)

The staff wished to have an alternative basis for determining the comparative ability to read and comprehend what was read of children in the ME schools and the other schools studied in this evaluation. It was decided to use an oral reading task, in which the child would, in an individual testing situation, be given a short passage to read after which he would be asked to answer four questions about the passage. The questions were designed to test for comprehension of vocabulary used in the passage, direct understanding of the passage (a question which could be answered in the words of the passage) and indirect understanding ( a question which could not be answered in the words of the passage but the answer was provided by the passage) and inference beyond the passage. Passages were selected from readers supplied by a principal of a school near The City College and were deliberately chosen from among readers not now widely used to reduce the possibility that any of the children would be asked to read a passage they had read or studied in school.

Children were selected for this test from the third grades of the ME schools. To provide a basis for selection, the reading grades for April 1967, when the children had completed the second grade, were used to stratify this population of third graders into three levels: children reading at or near (± .2) grade level, children below, and children above, grade level. An additional criterion for selection was an unbroken school career of three years for "Old" MES and two years for "New." The children in matched schools had comparable school records. Within each level the children were selected randomly. An MES sample of 96 children was selected and a child of the same sex in the third grade of the comparable Control or Special Service school with comparable second grade reading level was selected as a match and also tested. Because a pair was lost if either child could not be tested, the final sample consists of 60 pairs of children.

The reader should understand that this oral reading task was intended to serve a comparative purpose only, and the data will be used only to compare the children in the ME, Control, and Special Service schools. It was not intended, and will not be used, to provide any substantive estimate of the reading level of the children, and should not be confused with oral reading tests which do provide such estimates. Moreover, since no reliability data are available for the task, only a gross level of comparison is appropriate.

Instrument 8 is the subtest in Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts of the MAT battery.

Instrument 9 is the subtest in Problem Solving of the Iowa battery.

Verbal Fluency (Instruments 10 and 11)

Because of the emphasis in the MES proposal and program on increasing children's verbal fluency, the staff sought to obtain some estimate of the children's ability to understand when spoken to, as well as their ability to speak. To these ends, two tests originally developed for use in New York City by the staff of The Puerto Rican Study[5] were revised and adapted for use in this evaluation.

---

[5] The Puerto Rican Study, New York City Board of Education, 1957.

Understanding. To estimate the child's ability to understand when spoken to, the USE test (for Understanding of Spoken English) was revised. The USE test involves presenting the child with a picture of a complex scene and then asking him to identify specific things in the picture as well as to respond to questions about the picture. All of the stimulus material is on tape, so that the verbal stimuli presented are constant. The test yields two subscores, one considered a vocabulary score (based on the number of items correctly identified), the other a concept score (based on the number of questions correctly answered). For this evaluation two pictures were used, a classroom and a city street scene.

The test was originally developed for use with children whose native language was not English, so while the revised test is similar in structure to the original, several new items were developed that were intended to raise the level of difficulty of the test for use with children whose native language was English. The level of difficulty of the new items was estimated by trying out several such items with third grade children in schools not involved in this evaluation. The reliability of the test was estimated by the split-half procedure using the data from a randomly selected sample of children tested during the evaluation. For two samples of 100 children these estimates when adjusted for length of test by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula are .84 and .82, satisfactory for research and evaluation purposes.

The verbal fluency subtest in understanding was administered in grade 3 of all 15 ME schools but because of the limitations of time could only be administered in grade 3 in 13 of the 14 Control and Special Service schools. Seventy classes, totaling 1,256 children, were tested in the ME schools, 22 classes and 654 children in the Control schools, and 27 classes with 754 children in the Special Service schools.

Speaking. To test the child's ability to speak English, the staff used the technique used in the Puerto Rican study of showing the child a picture of a familiar scene filled with people and activity and asking him to tell what he "saw in the picture, and what the people in the picture were doing." To this we added a request for the child to select some one element or person in the picture and tell a story about that person or element. The picture used was of children and adults playing in a city park, with the apartment buildings and streets surrounding the park visible in the distance. The test was administered to children in the same schools and classes which were being tested for understanding. Each child was tested individually and his response was recorded on tape. Since the Speaking test was an individual test, it could only be administered to 226 children in the ME schools, 79 in the Control schools and 79 in the Special Service schools.

The test was scored to yield a count of the number of items the child correctly identified, and the number of identifications he qualified with some adjectival word or phrase. Two different efforts were made to rate the recordings of the stories for fluency of speech, but each time the speech consultants reported that, within the limits set by listening to the taped stories, they could not develop scales with any power to discriminate levels of fluency. Typically, most children scored at or near the top of the prototypes of the scales developed, which the consultants attributed to the fact that most children developmentally reached and exceeded the levels of discrimination possible when rating the fluency of taped speech samples. The alternative available was to analyze the fluency of transcriptions of the taped samples, but time and budget did not permit this analysis. Therefore, only the first two scores will be reported.

No estimates of the reliability of the Speaking test are available, and so here, too, only overall comparisons will be made.

## Self-Perception Inventory (Instrument 12)

The evaluation of self-image was based on categories devised and used by Jersild[6] in evaluating data collected for his study on self-acceptance. Jersild's data were collected from compositions written by students which described "What I Like About Myself" and "What I Dislike About Myself."

Care was taken in the process of constructing the instrument to exclude any items that might be considered an invasion of privacy. In fact, after careful consideration it was decided not to administer the second half of the original inventory[7], which was intended to obtain student opinions on some potentially controversial educational issues. These items were identical to a selected number of items contained in the parent questionnaire, and the original intent was to compare child and parental opinion. To administer this inventory, the evaluation staff recruited a team of parents of children in the participating schools. Through the cooperation of the Parent Association in each school, parents were informed of the opportunity to work for the project as data collectors. Those who expressed interest were invited to an orientation and training session conducted at The City College and were then scheduled for these data collection sessions. In all, some 62 parents participated in this phase of the project data collection.

Reliability and Validity of the Self-Image Inventory. The categories used in the self-image inventory derive from Jersild's study using a free-response instrument to determine what kinds of things children considered in talking about and evaluating themselves. It should be recognized that the populations used by Jersild were not directly comparable to the MES, C, and SS children, and that some items were eliminated because they might be considered an invasion of privacy. This inventory was administered to 1,046 ME, 605 C, and 144 SS school fifth graders.

Reliability of this instrument was determined by correlating the number of positive choices made by children on the odd and even numbered items. When adjusted by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula a reliability estimate of .81 was derived for the total instrument.

---

[6] Arthur T. Jersild, In Search of Self. Pp. 135-141, Teachers College Bureau of Publications, New York, 1962.

[7] The complete instrument appears in Appendix B.

## Survey of Teacher Opinion

Since the 1966-67 evaluation indicated near unanimous approval and enthusiasm for the MES program among teachers, in the 1967-68 survey it was decided to ask teachers to consider two other aspects of school functioning: role perceptions and decision-making.

## Role-Description Questionnaire (Instrument 13)

In an effort to obtain insight into the perceptions teachers and specialists have of the specialist's role, a role-description questionnaire was developed. The questionnaire was a simple descriptive form that asked the respondent to indicate the responsibilities he attributed to the role and then to rank these for importance and for the time actually devoted to each by the specialist holding that role in his school.

The role-description questionnaire was composed of four sets consisting of the following role combinations: 1) Administrative Assistant, Community Relations Coordinator, and Social Worker; 2) Audiovisual Teacher, Community Relations Coordinator, and Junior Guidance Teacher; 3) Auxiliary Teacher, Corrective Reading Teacher, and Guidance Counselor; and 4) Assistant Principal, Cluster Teacher, and Speech Teacher. Sets one and two were unique to MES, the other two sets were composed of roles commonly found in all the schools participating in the study. Some of these combinations were modified slightly in instances warranted by the school's staff make-up.

The percentage of questionnaire returns was generally poor. As a consequence, none of the non-MES data was utilized.

The Administrative Assistant, Auxiliary Teacher, Community Relations Coordinator, Corrective Reading Teacher, and Guidance Counselor questionnaire returns allow for sketchy descriptions of these roles as they are seen to function in an MES context.

## Decision-Making Questionnaire (Instrument 14)

The survey of decision-making practices was conducted by developing a questionnaire which listed seven hypothetical decisions, selected from the kinds of problems reported by teachers in the 1966-67 evaluation of the MES program. Respondents were given a list of all possible participants (ranging from the Board of Education on down) and were asked to indicate who should participate in making the decision, who actually would participate in making such a decision in their own school, and who should and would make the final decision. Two forms of this instrument were developed, each containing nine decisions.

## Administering the Teacher Opinion Instruments

In late May and early June, both the Role-Description Questionnaire and the Decision-Making Questionnaire were deposited in the mailboxes of the faculty members of the ten ME and ten non-ME schools selected for this phase of study. Each MES faculty member was given a return envelope, a

Role-Description Questionnaire set and either Form I or Form II of the Decision-Making Questionnaire. Each non-MES faculty member received either a Role-Description Questionnaire set or Forms I and II of the Decision-Making Questionnaire as well as a return envelope.

Parent Questionnaire (Instrument 15)

To estimate parental evaluation of the educational program, a questionnaire was developed that provided the parent with the opportunity to rate the school his child attended in comparison to other schools in the neighborhood and city, and to evaluate the MES program as he knew it. A second and physically separate section sought to survey parental opinion on some current educational issues.

When the teacher questionnaires were delivered to the ten ME and ten non-ME schools, letters were delivered to parents asking them to come to school on a given day to help take part in the evaluation of their child's school. The principals of each school were asked to distribute the letters to each child in the third and fifth grades.

On the designated day, a team of interviewers (themselves parents) arrived in each school to administer the parent questionnaire, Part I. The opinions of 89 MES and 34 non-MES parents were sampled. These parents, in addition, were given return envelopes and Part II of the parent questionnaire to fill out and mail at their leisure. Insufficient returns of these data preclude their inclusion as part of this report.

# CHAPTER III

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MES PROGRAM

One phase of the 1967-68 evaluation of the MES program was to bring up to date the extent to which certain elements of the original MES program, last evaluated for the 1964-65 school year in the 1966 Board of Education MES evaluation have been implemented. To do this the Facilities Questionnaire was sent to each of the 16 schools in the sample. All but one of the schools completed and returned the questionnaire; therefore, unless otherwise noted, all data were based on the 15 schools responding.

### Provision of Education for Three- and Four-Year-Olds

According to the 1967-68 project proposal for the MES program the 15 ME schools were allotted 54 teaching positions, 34 teacher aides, 19 family workers, 15 family assistants, and 35 other teaching personnel for the development of prekindergarten classes. Enrollment was expected to total 1,017 pupils for 16 schools.[1] The 15 schools reported total enrollment of 787 pupils in prekindergarten, somewhat less than expected even if allowance is made for the sixteenth school. No classes for three-year-olds were reported. There were 57 classes for four-year-old children with a median of 14.9 children in each class (see Table 2). Although, as Table 2 indicates, there was variation from school to school, this number of classes (57) is close to the number of teaching positions allocated (54).

For these same schools, the 1966 MES study recorded two classes for three-year-olds (in one school) and 62 classes for four-year-olds with a comparable number (15) of children in each class. Thus there has been a slight decline in the facilities offered to the three- and four-year-old children.

### Utilization of School Facilities

The earliest time at which a teacher was on duty in the schools ranged from 8:00 A.M. to 8:30 A.M., with one school reporting that its teachers did not have pre-class duty. The morning session started at 8:30 for two of the schools and at 8:50 for another two schools, with the remaining eleven beginning at 8:40 A.M. Eighty per cent of the schools closed their regular session at the same time every day with the majority (64 per cent) closing at 3:00 P.M. Otherwise the closing time ranged from 3:00 to 5:00 P.M.

The 1966 report stated, "All schools in the More Effective Schools Program are actually open from 8:40 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. From 8:40 to 3:00 the children attend the regular school session; from 3:00 to 5:00 the After School Study Center takes over."[2] This was still true in 1968, except for the two schools that opened at 8:50 A.M.

---

[1] This was reported only as a total and so the estimate for the 15 responding schools could not be determined.

[2] Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program Summary Report, September 1966, Op.cit.

## TABLE 2

### COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF PREKINDERGARTEN CLASSES AND NUMBER OF PREKINDERGARTEN TEACHERS, AS DESCRIBED IN BOARD OF EDUCATION MES PROJECT PROPOSAL, BY SCHOOL

| School | Number of Prekindergarten Teachers Allotted in Proposal | Number of Prekindergarten Classes Reported |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 0 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | 2 | 4 |
| 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 9 | 2 | 4 |
| 10 | 12 | 12 |
| 11 | 4 | 4 |
| 12 | 4 | 4 |
| 13 | 2 | 4 |
| 14 | 4 | 4 |
| 15 | 4 | 2 |
| Total | 54 | 57 |

In answering the questionnaire, 93 per cent (all but one) of the schools reported that all classrooms were fully utilized for instructional purposes during regular school hours. Other times during the week that the schools could have been utilized were broken down into the following three time periods: 3:00 - 5:00 P.M., 5:00 - 7:00 P.M., and 7:00 - 10:00 P.M.

From 3:00 - 5:00 P.M. four schools utilized "one-half" of the physical capacity of the school and 11 schools utilized "some, but not half." However, from 5:00 - 7:00 P.M. only two schools used "some" of the physical capacity of the school, and the remaining 13 schools (87%) did not make any use of the school's capacity. From 7:00 - 10:00 P.M., 11 schools utilized the physical capacity of the school to "some" extent and four did not use the school at all.

On Saturdays, seven schools were utilized to "some" extent and eight schools were not, while on Sundays, only one school was used to "some" extent.

During the summer, some of the schools were used as Summer Day Schools and/or Summer Day Camps. It is disappointing to note, however, that in no case was the full capacity of the school used for Summer School, and in only two schools was this full capacity used for Summer Camp. "Half" of the physical capacity of five schools was used for Summer School and another third of the schools were utilized to "some" extent. The remaining third were not used at all for Summer Day Schools. Half of the physical capacity of one of the schools was used for Summer Camp while 40 per cent (6) of the schools were used to some extent. In another 40 per cent of the schools there was no Summer Day Camp.

## Efforts to Overcome Pupil Mobility

One of the original goals of the MES program was to overcome the effects of pupil and family mobility and to encourage pupils to remain in their schools. This was to be accomplished through cooperation with social agencies and adjustment in the present transfer regulations. Seventy-three per cent of the schools reported that they have made attempts to retain pupils after their families have moved to a different neighborhood. In the 1966 report on MES, the Board of Education stated that this could not be implemented for several reasons, among them the fact that apartments were not available in the same area and the lack of reasonable bus transportation for those pupils who moved out of the area. Thus there has been some progress in developing plans to achieve this goal, but no real achievement in the sense of retaining pupils in numbers sufficient to talk about reducing mobility.

## Affiliations with Local Colleges and Universities

None of the ME schools is affiliated with a local college or university as an officially designated "campus school." However, 79 per cent of the schools have teacher training programs in conjunction with one or more New York City colleges, involving an average of 9.5 teachers per school and a total of 11 different colleges and universities. This is an increase in college affiliations, for the 1966 study reported affiliations with only six colleges and universities.

## Implementation of Nongraded Bloc Teaching

According to the MES project application, 390 pupils were scheduled to be enrolled in nongraded blocs. However, not one of the 15 schools reported having any ungraded blocs of classes (one school qualified its response by reporting that it had ungraded blocs of classes for Junior

Guidance and CRMD classes). Although the nongraded bloc method had also been included in the 1965-66 MES program proposal, the 1966 evaluation reported a nongraded bloc in only one school -- and then only for five- and six-year-olds. Clearly this aspect of the program remains to be implemented.

## Limitations on Class Size

Implicit in the MES concept is the limitation in size of classes and instructional groups. Classes are to be limited to 15 at the prekindergarten level, and thereafter to 22. The evaluation of the extent to which these limits are being practiced is based on data obtained by asking each observer to count the number of children in the room in the course of his ILOR observation. These data are presented in Table 3 for the early childhood grades and Table 4 for the elementary grades. The reader should be alert to the fact that the data in these tables refer to the size of instructional groups, not to the size of official class rosters (which were within the official limits). In a sense this is a more rigorous test of the extent to which the small size concept has been implemented since instructional groups were formed from more than one class. Even by this more rigorous test, the data indicate that the ME schools are limiting the size of groups within the guidelines established. Of the 102 prekindergarten lessons observed, only 8 per cent were taught to groups of more than 15, whereas 32 per cent of the 25 C, and 18 per cent of the 22 SS lessons at this level were taught to groups of 16 or more. At kindergarten and first grade, and at all other elementary grades as well, the limitation of 22 ME children was also observed except for an occasional single lesson or class. Thus the data indicate that this aspect of the MES program has been fully implemented in the actual practice of classroom instruction.

The data in Tables 3 and 4 also indicate that children receive instruction in small groups of 10 or fewer more often in the ME than in the C or SS schools in first and second grade, and in groups of 15 or fewer in the higher grades. For example, in kindergarten, where 53 per cent of the lessons were taught to groups of 10 or fewer in ME schools, only 15 per cent of the C school lessons and 19 per cent of the SS school lessons were.

## Provision for Specialists

The MES project proposal stated the number of full time and part time specialists allocated to each of the 16 schools funded under Title I. Since each school was specified, total allocations could be determined for the 15 responding schools. Table 5 presents these numbers and the numbers currently in the schools. The table also presents the number of specialists added and the number lost for the 1967-68 academic year. The 1966 MES report listed the number of specialists for all 21 schools combined, so although the types of specialist can be compared (they were the same), the numbers cannot.

Overall, the table indicates that the schools reported more specialists on staff than allocated, i.e., 362 teaching specialists whereas only 285 were allocated. This discrepancy is attributable simply to confusion as to

## TABLE 3

## SIZE OF INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPS BY SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADE, NUMBER AND PER CENT, EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

| | | MES | | C plus SS | | C | | SS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Size | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| PreK | 1-5 | 32 | 31 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| | 6-10 | 22 | 22 | 18 | 39 | 8 | 32 | 10 | 46 |
| | 11-15 | 40 | 39 | 13 | 28 | 5 | 20 | 8 | 36 |
| | 16-22 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| | 23+ | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 4 | 16 | 4 | 18 |
| Grade Total | | 102 | | 47 | | 25 | | 22 | |
| K | 1-5 | 35 | 36 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 12 |
| | 6-10 | 17 | 17 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 7 |
| | 11-15 | 21 | 21 | 35 | 29 | 15 | 26 | 20 | 35 |
| | 16-22 | 26 | 26 | 39 | 33 | 29 | 49 | 10 | 17 |
| | 23+ | 0 | 0 | 23 | 20 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 29 |
| Grade Total | | 99 | | 117 | | 59 | | 58 | |
| 1 | 1-5 | 15 | 18 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| | 6-10 | 23 | 28 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 18 | 3 | 6 |
| | 11-15 | 11 | 13 | 17 | 18 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 32 |
| | 16-22 | 34 | 41 | 36 | 37 | 25 | 50 | 11 | 24 |
| | 23+ | 0 | 0 | 26 | 27 | 11 | 22 | 15 | 32 |
| Grade Total | | 83 | | 97 | | 50 | | 47 | |

TABLE 4

SIZE OF INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPS BY SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADE, NUMBER AND PER CENT, ELEMENTARY GRADES

| | | MES | | C plus SS | | C | | SS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Size | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| 2 | 1-10 | 6 | 27 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 |
| | 11-15 | 6 | 27 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 12 |
| | 16-22 | 9 | 41 | 7 | 35 | 7 | 59 | 0 | 0 |
| | 23+ | 1 | 5 | 9 | 45 | 4 | 33 | 5 | 63 |
| Grade Total | | 22 | | 20 | | 12 | | 8 | |
| 3 | 1-10 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 8 |
| | 11-15 | 8 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 16-22 | 10 | 48 | 7 | 32 | 3 | 30 | 4 | 33 |
| | 23+ | 0 | 0 | 13 | 59 | 6 | 60 | 7 | 59 |
| Grade Total | | 21 | | 22 | | 10 | | 12 | |
| 4 | 1-10 | 4 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 11-15 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 16-22 | 9 | 50 | 10 | 53 | 2 | 25 | 8 | 73 |
| | 23+ | 2 | 11 | 9 | 47 | 6 | 75 | 3 | 27 |
| Grade Total | | 18 | | 19 | | 8 | | 11 | |
| 5 | 1-10 | 4 | 19 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 22 | 1 | 8 |
| | 11-15 | 7 | 33 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| | 16-22 | 9 | 43 | 7 | 33 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 50 |
| | 23+ | 1 | 5 | 9 | 43 | 6 | 67 | 3 | 25 |
| Grade Total | | 21 | | 21 | | 9 | | 12 | |

Table 4 (Continued)

| | | MES | | C plus SS | | C | | SS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Size | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent | No. | Per Cent |
| 6 | 1-10 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| | 11-15 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| | 16-22 | 11 | 79 | 3 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 60 |
| | 23+ | 0 | 0 | 4 | 45 | 3 | 75 | 1 | 20 |
| Grade Total | | 14 | | 9 | | 4 | | 5 | |

which positions were supported by Title I funds and which by other budgetary sources.[3] Generally, the more important finding, and the reason for this part of the evaluation, is that the ME schools do have the kinds of staff specialists necessary to implement the teaching, guidance, and supportive service components of the program.

The data in Table 5 also indicate that in 1967-68 the ME schools added no specialists and lost a total of 34 teaching specialist positions. These were primarily in the areas of speech (8), health counseling (7), audio-visual (4), and language resources (4).

## Community Relations Coordinator

One role, that of Community Relations Coordinator, was chosen for special study. Twelve of the 15 schools had a coordinator; of the other three, one reported the use of the line for a different purpose and two stated that the line had not been filled. Twelve of the 13 schools with coordinators completed the form asking for how the coordinator used his time, and Table 6 summarizes these responses.

In these schools, on the average, the Community Relations Coordinator spent 29 per cent of his time out in the community and 71 per cent of his time in the school. Predominantly (31 per cent) the in-school time of the Community Relations Coordinator was spent on community oriented activities; other major activities were meeting with teachers (10 per cent) or other staff (11 per cent), clerical work relating to his job (8 per cent), and school related activities other than the above (11 per cent).

---

[3] This confusion was directly reflected in the fact that the schools reported 15 librarians supplied under Title I funds, when the proposal calls for none.

## TABLE 5

## SPECIALISTS ALLOCATED AND ON THE STAFF, AND CHANGES IN 1967-68, 15 ME SCHOOLS ONLY

| Position | Number Allocated | Number Now on Full Time Staff | Number Now on Part Time Staff | Number Added in 1967-68 | Number Lost In 1967-68 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teaching Specialists** | | | | | |
| Cluster | 145 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Music | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Art | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Reading Improvement | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Corrective Reading | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Language Resources | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Speech | 4 | 4 | 2.4 | .1 | 8 |
| Science | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Health Education | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Health Counselor | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Audiovisual | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Industrial Arts | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Junior Guidance | 41 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Attendance | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Admin. Assistant | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 285 | 362 | 2.4 | .1 | 34 |
| **Service Specialists** | | | | | |
| Guidance Counselor | 31 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| School Psychologist | 12 | 12 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Social Worker | 22.5 | 15 | .8 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 65.5 | 70 | 2.4 | 0 | 0 |
| **Other** | | | | | |
| Community Relations Coordinator | 15 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Overall, the Community Relations Coordinator on the average devoted 60 per cent of his time on direct community related activities, evenly divided between time in the community (29 per cent) and in school (31 per cent). The variation in the utilization of this staff position should also be noted, for the column on range indicates that within this average is a range of from as little as 10 per cent on direct community activity to 50 per cent.

TABLE 6

PER CENT OF TIME THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS
COORDINATOR DEVOTES TO VARIOUS FUNCTIONS
(N=12 ME Schools)

| Activity | Mean Per Cent of Time Devoted to Activity | | Range of Per Cent of Time Devoted to Activity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Out in Community | 29 | | 10 - 50 | |
| 2) In School | 71 | | 50 - 90 | |
| a) On community oriented activities (e.g., meeting with parents) | | 31 | | 10 - 50 |
| b) Meeting with teachers | | 10 | | 5 - 15 |
| c) Meeting with other staff (i.e., administration, guidance counselor, etc.) | | 11 | | 5 - 15 |
| d) Completing clerical aspects of job | | 8 | | 1 - 20 |
| e) On other school related activities | | 11 | | 0 - 20 |

## Provision for School, Teacher, and Audiovisual Aides

On the Facilities Questionnaire, the schools were asked to indicate the hours allocated to them for four kinds of aides: school aides, teacher aides (separately for prekindergarten and kindergarten), and audiovisual aides. Table 7 summarizes the responses in comparison to the allocations proposed.

The total number of hours reported (129,908) is in excess of the number proposed (111,974), with all of the difference attributable to an excess in the number of school aide hours (44,848); this is only partially balanced by a lack of hours for kindergarten teacher aides (27,636 less). Obviously, these terms and roles are interchanged in the interval between proposal and implementation. Moreover, the precision with which aides are supplied to specific schools as suggested in the proposal is also weak. For example, although the number of prekindergarten teacher aide hours closely approximates the number allocated, one school reported more than twice the number of positions allocated and another school, in the same borough, had only one-fifth the amount that it should have had. Similarly, at the kindergarten level three of the nine schools had their allocated number of kindergarten teacher aides. However, two schools had more than those allocated, and although 19 positions were proposed for the other four schools not one of the four reported any kindergarten teacher aides.

If the proposed allocations are to be taken seriously, then there were extreme deviations in 1967-68.

TABLE 7

HOURS OF AIDE TIME AVAILABLE,
MES ONLY[1]

| | Number of Hours | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Position | Proposed Per Year | Reported by Schools Per Year | Mean Per Diem | Range Per Diem |
| School Aide | 43,700 | 88,548 | 52.3 | 12 - 76 |
| Teacher Aide PreK | 19,176 | 19,928 | 11.8 | 2 - 26 |
| Teacher Aide K | 46,248 | 18,612 | 12.0 | 0 - 36 |
| Audiovisual Aide | 2,850 | 2,820 | 1.7 | 0 - 5 |
| Total | 111,974 | 129,908 | | |

---

[1] Based on 9 schools which specified the number of hours allocated.

## Provision of Audiovisual Materials

Table 8 shows the mean number of pieces of audiovisual equipment available in the schools and those added since September 1967. The only significant additions in 1967-68 were 53 tape recorders, 19 film strip viewers, and 14 cameras; only the tape recorders were widely distributed (11 schools). There was no comparable breakdown on equipment available in the 1966 MES report. It merely stated: "A complete range of audiovisual equipment was used by all schools in the More Effective Schools program," and listed the type of equipment without reporting the number received by the individual schools. The types of materials were similar to those on hand now.

## TABLE 8

## MEAN NUMBER OF PIECES OF AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT THAT THE SCHOOLS HAVE NOW AND NEW SINCE SEPTEMBER 1967

(N=15 Schools)

| Equipment | Mean Number Have Now | Mean Number New Since September '67 | Number of Schools Receiving New Equipment | Total New Since 1967 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Closed circuit television | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 mm. sound motion picture projector | 5.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Film strip projector | 26.6 | .3 | 1 | 5 |
| Film strip viewers | 23.9 | 1.3 | 2 | 19 |
| Overhead projectors | 13.0 | .1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3¼ x 4 slide projectors | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3¼ x 4 opaque projectors | 2.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tape recorders (with earphone sets and connection boxes) | 12.7 | 3.5 | 11 | 53[a] |
| Phonographs | 47.7 | .1 | 1 | 2 |
| Radio receivers | 15.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TV receivers | 6.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cameras | 5.7 | .9 | 7 | 14 |
| Other equipment | 10.1 | .1 | 1 | 1 |

---

[a] One school did not receive new tape recorders. However, it received 90 earphones and 25 connection boxes.

# RESULTS

## SECTION I

## Elementary Grades: 2 through 6

# CHAPTER IV

## SCHOOL FUNCTIONING: ELEMENTARY GRADES

On the General School Report (GSR), and in a section of the Individual Lesson Observation Report (ILOR), the observers were asked to assess several aspects of each ME and Control or Special Service (C/SS) school as a total entity. An overall judgment was given in terms of the school's climate (as reflected in the attitudes of the administrative staff, teachers, supplementary staff, and pupils), and the school's physical attractiveness. An overall evaluation of program was obtained by asking observers their feelings about sending a child of their own to the school visited, and what they felt the cost of the pupil day they saw was worth, in comparison to the cost of a typical school day. They also enumerated the effective features they saw in each school as well as the problems they felt should be corrected. Finally, in the ME schools only, the observers were asked for an overall opinion of the MES program based on the supposition that the school they had just seen was typical of the MES program.

### Climate and Attractiveness

Table 9 presents the data for the ten aspects of school climate and attractiveness studied. In comparing the ME schools to the C/SS, there were statistically significant differences in favor of the ME schools for seven of the ten overall characteristics.

Looking at the ME ratings, it can be noted that more than 50 per cent of the ratings were "above average" for all ten characteristics. In the C/SS classes this level of approval was reached for only three characteristics: the attitude of the administrative staff, the individual classroom teacher-pupil relationship, and the individual classroom's atmosphere in terms of warmth and discipline. These are the three characteristics for which there were no statistically significant differences between ME and C/SS.

### Comparing 1967 and 1968 in Climate and Attractiveness, MES Only

Seven of the ten characteristics had been rated in the 1967 evaluation, and Table 10 presents the distributions of ratings for these seven for the two years. In comparing the data of 1967 to this year's, no significant difference was found in any of the seven evaluation aspects.

### Observers' Overall Evaluation

Table 11 presents the data on the observers' overall evaluation. When asked their feelings about sending their child to the school they visited, the observers were more positive about the ME schools: 60 per cent of the observers were enthusiastic, or strongly positive, about the idea for the ME schools, compared to 35 per cent for the C/SS schools.

## TABLE 9

### DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON GSR AND ILOR FOR OVERALL FUNCTIONING, BY SCHOOL TYPE, IN PER CENT[a]

| | Above | | | | Average | | | | Below | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristic | MES | C/SS | C | S | MES | C/SS | C | S | MES | C/SS | C | S |
| Attractiveness of building | 67 | 29 | 21 | 36 | 20 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 13 | 42 | 50 | 35 |
| Attractiveness of classroom | 80 | 36 | 29 | 43 | 17 | 50 | 57 | 43 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| General school climate | 80 | 36 | 29 | 43 | 17 | 53 | 57 | 50 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 7 |
| Attitude of teaching staff toward children | 76 | 36 | 29 | 43 | 17 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 7 | 14 | 21 | 7 |
| Attitude of administration staff | 79 | 59 | 43 | 77 | 21 | 30 | 43 | 15 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 8 |
| Attitude of supplementary teaching and service staff | 78 | 33 | 22 | 44 | 22 | 61 | 78 | 44 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 |
| Attitude of children toward teaching staff | 70 | 37 | 31 | 43 | 30 | 48 | 54 | 43 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 14 |
| Overall teacher-pupil relationship | 75 | 71 | 67 | 74 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 7 | 12 | 16 | 8 |
| Classroom's appearance | 51 | 25 | 30 | 20 | 40 | 55 | 51 | 60 | 9 | 20 | 19 | 20 |
| Atmosphere in terms of discipline and warmth | 51 | 58 | 51 | 65 | 41 | 30 | 35 | 25 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 10 |

---

[a] The basic number of observations for all Tables in this Chapter are as follows: for the GSR, 30 ME; 14 C; and 14 SS. Then for the ILOR, 96 ME; 43 C; and 48 SS. This latter set of numbers is slightly higher than the number of classes seen (Table 1) since on occasion an observer saw two lessons during a class and so completed two ILORs.

## TABLE 10

## DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON GSR FOR OVERALL FUNCTIONING, MES 1967 AND 1968, IN PER CENT

MES Only

| Characteristic | Above 1967 | Above 1968 | Average 1967 | Average 1968 | Below 1967 | Below 1968 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attractiveness of building | 67 | 67 | 15 | 20 | 18 | 13 |
| Attractiveness of classroom | 85 | 80 | 10 | 17 | 5 | 3 |
| General school climate | 75 | 80 | 15 | 17 | 10 | 3 |
| Attitude of teaching staff | 70 | 76 | 26 | 17 | 4 | 7 |
| Attitude of administration staff | 74 | 79 | 18 | 21 | 8 | 0 |
| Attitude of supplementary teaching and service staff | 66 | 78 | 30 | 22 | 3 | 0 |
| Attitude of children toward teaching staff | 64 | 70 | 28 | 30 | 8 | 0 |

## TABLE 11

## OBSERVERS' OVERALL EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IN TERMS OF VALUE OF PUPIL DAY AND PLACING OWN CHILD IN SCHOOL OBTAINED ON GSR

| | 1967 | 1968 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Criterion | MES | MES | C/SS | C | SS |
| Own child in school - | | | | | |
| enthusiastic | 57 | 60 | 35 | 31 | 38 |
| accepting | 33 | 30 | 30 | 31 | 31 |
| rejecting | 10 | 10 | 35 | 38 | 31 |
| Worth of pupil day - | | | | | |
| Above average | 40 | 59 | 18 | 0 | 36 |
| average | 35 | 27 | 53 | 64 | 43 |
| below average | 24 | 14 | 29 | 36 | 21 |

A similar finding is shown in the ratings the observers reported in answer to how much they thought the pupil day they saw was worth. Asked to evaluate the value of a pupil day in the school they had seen, assuming the pupil day in the average school costs'x'dollars, 59 per cent said the MES day was worth more, a rating not one observer gave to a Control school and 36 per cent gave to the SS schools. Once more,going back to last year's study for the MES data only, there was no statistically significant change in either the worth of a pupil day or the observers' feelings about having their child sent to the ME school they had seen.

## Effective Features and Problems

The observers were asked to single out the most effective feature in each classroom visited and then asked for additional positive aspects. In the context of comparing the ME and C/SS schools, whereas 3 per cent of the observers reported no single positive feature for MES, 25 per cent reported none for the C/SS schools. The single most effective features mentioned also differed in the ME and C/SS schools. The three given most often in the ME schools were "small classes" (23 per cent), "ability grouping" (16 per cent), and "the amount of materials available" (13 per cent). In C/SS schools the observers cited "the excellent teacher control for good class behavior" (21 per cent), the teacher-pupil relationship (14 per cent), and effective teaching (11 per cent).

Asked for secondary effective features, the observers in ME schools noted small classes again, the effectiveness of the specialists and auxiliary teachers, the teachers' relaxed attitude, and the use of teaching and audiovisual aids. In the C/SS schools,observers again listed effective teaching in addition to the pupils' positive attitude and the amount of available material.

When asked to describe the problems they discerned in the school visited, the observers noted more than twice as many for the C/SS schools as for MES (38 to 18). Among the problems pinpointed most often in the C/SS schools were ineffective teaching (6), large classes (6), teachers' rigid control (3), and poor pupil attitude (3). In the ME schools a few observers noted ineffective teaching (2), poor pupil attitude (2), a lack of individual attention (2), and scattered individual references.

## Continuation of the MES Program

In Table 12 data are presented for the observer's recommendation on the MES program, made after the day in school. All the observers recommended that MES be continued, although a great majority wanted slight modifications. Three suggestions were made frequently: specialized teacher training to utilize more effectively the small classes available, more creative teaching, and a program to psychologically orient teachers going into "disadvantaged areas" in order to improve pupil-teacher relationships.

Part B of Table 12, which compares the data on this question for 1967 and 1968, indicates that in 1968 fewer observers felt that the program needed strong modification.

TABLE 12

OBSERVERS' RECOMMENDATION ON FUTURE OF PROGRAM;
IN PER CENT; (A) BY ME SCHOOL; (B) 1967-1968

A

| Response Category | Old | New |
|---|---|---|
| Retain as is | 7 | 25 |
| Slightly change | 72 | 50 |
| Strongly modify | 21 | 25 |
| Abolish | 0 | 0 |

B

| Response Category | 1967 | 1968 |
|---|---|---|
| Retain as is | 17 | 17 |
| Slightly change | 36 | 60 |
| Strongly modify | 47 | 23 |
| Abolish | 0 | 0 |

## SUMMARY

The data in this area of overall school functioning are simple to summarize: by the criteria we used, the observers saw above average school functioning in the ME schools and consistent qualitative differences in favor of the ME schools. Consequently they felt that the school day was worth more and that they would be satisfied, and even enthusiastic, about sending their children to these schools.

# CHAPTER V

# TEACHER AND PUPIL FUNCTIONING IN CLASS: ELEMENTARY GRADES

On the ILOR, the observers were asked to rate in-class functioning in terms of what teachers did and how pupils functioned. In this chapter these data are presented first for the teacher and then for the pupil.

## Teacher Functioning

The evaluation of teacher functioning presented here is based on data compiled from the two instruments the observers completed, the ILOR and the GSR. Fourteen specific aspects of teacher functioning were studied; eleven were concerned with the teaching process as related to academic instruction, and three with the teacher's verbal communication with the pupils. The data on these aspects[1] appear in Table 13.

## Academic Instruction

Eleven of the items the observers rated pertained specifically to aspects of the teachers' academic instruction. Differences on these items between MES and C/SS were less pronounced than those reported in the previous chapter for overall school functioning. There were no significant differences in the pattern of ratings given ME and C/SS teachers in seven instances. For the other four aspects, the proportion of above average ratings was statistically significantly higher in ME schools than in C/SS schools. These four involved "discipline and control," the "amount of planning and organization evident in the lessons seen," the "extent to which the lesson referred to earlier work," and the "extent to which the lesson established a foundation for independent work."

For "overall quality of instruction," the observers rated half the MES lessons (52 per cent) above average, but the difference between MES and C/SS (42 per cent above average) was not statistically significant. For "depth of instruction" and the "extent to which the lesson laid a foundation for future work," nearly half (48 per cent and 46 per cent) of the ratings for ME schools were above average. The observers found that more than half the lessons they saw, regardless of school type, showed what they considered a below average level of "creativity and imagination," and "little or no use" of teaching aids.

## Comparing 1967 and 1968 on Academic Instruction

In comparing the MES ratings of last year and this year in the area of teacher functioning (Table 14), the data were basically stable, for there were statistically significant differences in only four of the 11 aspects evaluated in both years. For three of these (amount of planning and organization, references to earlier material, and use of the children's background and experience) the 1968 ratings were more positive, while for the "level of creativity and imagination" evidenced in the observed lessons, the proportion of above average and average ratings dropped from 72 per cent to 50 per cent.

---

[1] Data are presented for only two of the three items on verbal communication. Data for the item on "communication with non-English speaking children" are omitted since in at least four out of five classes there were too few non-English speaking children for this to be rated.

## TABLE 13

## DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR AND GSR FOR TEACHER FUNCTIONING, BY SCHOOL TYPE, IN PER CENT

| | Above | | | | Average | | | | Below | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristic | MES | C/SS | C | S | MES | C/SS | C | S | MES | C/SS | C | S |
| Overall quality of instruction | 52 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 38 | 33 | 32 | 33 | 10 | 25 | 26 | 25 |
| Amount of planning and organization | 32 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 63 | 66 | 65 | 66 | 5 | 22 | 26 | 20 |
| Level of creativity and imagination | 24 | 12 | 14 | 10 | 26 | 26 | 21 | 31 | 50 | 62 | 65 | 59 |
| Use of children's background and experience | 32 | 28 | 39 | 18 | 48 | 46 | 39 | 51 | 20 | 26 | 22 | 31 |
| Use of teaching aids | 12 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 31 | 20 | 12 | 27 | 57 | 78 | 83 | 73 |
| Extent of reference to earlier material | 31 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 51 | 52 | 51 | 53 | 18 | 36 | 39 | 34 |
| Extent to which lesson was foundation for future work | 46 | 41 | 41 | 41 | 46 | 42 | 46 | 39 | 8 | 17 | 13 | 20 |
| Extent to which lesson was foundation for independent work | 35 | 17 | 10 | 23 | 43 | 50 | 52 | 48 | 22 | 33 | 38 | 29 |
| Amount of material covered | 39 | 26 | 26 | 27 | 48 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 13 | 25 | 25 | 24 |
| Depth of instruction | 48 | 32 | 37 | 29 | 36 | 42 | 36 | 46 | 16 | 26 | 27 | 25 |
| Discipline and control | 80 | 51 | 39 | 64 | 20 | 37 | 45 | 29 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 7 |
| Overall handling of children's questions | 45 | 33 | 32 | 33 | 22 | 27 | 23 | 30 | 33 | 40 | 45 | 37 |
| Verbal communication with the children | 91 | 88 | 83 | 92 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 |

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR AND GSR FOR TEACHER FUNCTIONING, MES 1967 AND 1968, IN PER CENT[a]

| | MES Only | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Above | | Average | | Below | |
| Characteristic | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 |
| Overall quality of instruction | 46 | 52 | 34 | 38 | 20 | 10 |
| Amount of planning and organization | 20 | 32 | 51 | 63 | 29 | 5 |
| Level of creativity and imagination | 37 | 24 | 35 | 26 | 28 | 50 |
| Use of children's background and experience | 19 | 32 | 63 | 48 | 18 | 20 |
| Use of teaching aids | 6 | 12 | 38 | 31 | 56 | 57 |
| Extent of reference to earlier material | 18 | 31 | 62 | 51 | 20 | 18 |
| Extent to which lesson was foundation for future work | 34 | 46 | 57 | 46 | 9 | 8 |
| Extent to which lesson was foundation for independent work | 28 | 35 | 52 | 43 | 20 | 22 |
| Amount of material covered | 40 | 39 | 44 | 48 | 16 | 13 |
| Depth of instruction | 38 | 48 | 40 | 36 | 22 | 16 |
| Discipline | 75 | 51 | 23 | 41 | 2 | 8 |

---

[a] The data in this chapter are based on the basic N for the GSR and ILOR reported in Table 9.

## Verbal Communication

The observers were asked to describe three phases of a teacher's communication with pupils: 1) overall handling of the children's questions, 2) the verbal communication with the children, 3) the verbal communication with non-English speaking pupils. As noted earlier, there were so few non-English speaking pupils in the classes seen that no meaningful ratings of the latter item could be generated. On the other two criteria (see Table 13), there were no statistically significant differences between the ME and the C/SS schools. In all schools the observers were impressed with the quality of the teachers' verbal communication with the children, for 83 per cent to 92 per cent of the ratings were above average. However, the observers were less often impressed with the handling of questions, for the distribution of ratings did not depart from chance expectation.

## Lesson Effectiveness and Class Size

We asked the observers their judgment of what would have happened to the effectiveness of the lesson they had seen had the class size been changed. In the ME schools they were asked to hypothesize a larger number of pupils, and in the C/SS schools a lesser number. The observers in the C/SS schools reported that 75 per cent of the lessons they had seen would not have been any more effective in a smaller class. In ME schools, the observers felt that 80 per cent of the lessons witnessed would have lost effectiveness had the class size been larger. This was significantly greater than the 59 per cent who had said this in 1967, indicating that instruction had been adapted to utilize the potential of small class size to a greater degree this present school term than in 1967.

## Use of Ability Grouping

Asked about the use of ability grouping in the schools, the observers reported its utilization in half the lessons seen in the ME schools (53 per cent), compared to one-fourth (26 per cent) of the lessons in the C/SS schools. The majority of the ability grouping in MES combined several classes across the grade, whereas in the C/SS schools almost all the ability grouping was done within the class unit. Comparing the 1968 findings to 1967, there was a 100 per cent increase in the use of ability grouping in ME schools this year; from 24 per cent of the lessons to 53 per cent.

## Summary

Teacher functioning in all three kinds of schools was rated generally high. However, the observers noted the lack of creativity and imagination and the limited use of aids. Teachers were considered particularly strong in maintaining good classroom control, the depth of instruction, establishing a foundation for future work, and verbal communication with children. Considering both the comparison of ME and C/SS and the 1967-68 comparison within the MES program, the general finding on the 13 aspects of teacher functioning evaluated is that the programs did not differ significantly (on 9 of 13), and that, in 1968, teachers functioned in the MES schools at levels no different than in 1967 (on 7 of 11). However, those differences which were noted were consistently indicative of more effective teacher functioning in the ME schools. The data on class size and grouping indicate that the teachers in the ME schools were taking advantage of the small class size and using ability grouping more consistently than they had in 1967.

## Pupil Functioning

On the ILOR there were eight items in which the observers rated children's interest and enthusiasm in the lesson, comprehension of the teacher's word, verbal fluency, and relationship with their peers. These data are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR FOR PUPIL FUNCTIONING, BY SCHOOL TYPE, IN PER CENT

| | Above | | | | Average | | | | Below | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristic | ME | C/SS | C | S | ME | C/SS | C | S | ME | C/SS | C | S |
| Children's interest and enthusiasm | 54 | 51 | 48 | 54 | 17 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 29 | 36 | 40 | 31 |
| Children volunteered in response to teacher | 41 | 40 | 43 | 37 | 24 | 24 | 21 | 28 | 35 | 36 | 36 | 35 |
| Children raised questions | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 90 | 97 | 97 | 98 |
| Overall participation of children | 76 | 66 | 61 | 71 | 8 | 15 | 14 | 17 | 16 | 19 | 25 | 12 |
| Children's general understanding of teacher's word | 88 | 85 | 77 | 92 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 0 |
| Overall verbal fluency of children who participated | 75 | 62 | 69 | 54 | 25 | 30 | 28 | 32 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 14 |
| Verbal communication among the children | 69 | 41 | 57 | 30 | 31 | 39 | 43 | 37 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 33 |
| Overall relationship among the children | 88 | 80 | 79 | 82 | 10 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 |

Generally, the distribution of ratings was positive except for the frequency of children's questions. Otherwise in ME and C/SS schools at least 39 per cent and as many as 88 per cent of the ratings were above average. There were no differences by type of school; of the eight in-class ILOR ratings, only one (verbal communication among children) showed a statistically significant difference between ME and C/SS. Here, the verbal communication among the children was judged as being characterized by better articulation and grammar in the ME schools.

Since there were no significant differences between ME and C/SS schools in the remaining seven items judged, one can note that in all three kinds of schools, typically, the observers rated as above average the children's general understanding of the teacher's word, the overall relationship among the children, the number of children who participated, their verbal fluency, and the number of children who showed interest and enthusiasm. In contrast, when we turn to children's questioning and response to teacher questions, an almost even distribution in ratings for above, average, and below was noted for the number of children who voluntarily responded to the teacher's questions; and when asked how many children raised questions during the lesson, the observers reported that in at least 90 per cent of the lessons "few or no children" did in any of the schools visited. This same observation was made last year in the ME and C schools, and so, stimulating inquiry by pupils is a continued lack in the teaching process noted in these schools.

## Comparing 1967 and 1968

Comparing last year's data to this year's in ME schools, we found that,in two of the five instances where the same rating was made,there were two indications of changed pupil functioning in 1968: the sharp increase (of 53 per cent) in the above average ratings for the children's verbal fluency, and a less sharp change, but of reverse direction, in the response pattern on children's interest and enthusiasm. Here the proportion in the above average category was the same in both years, but this year fewer of the lessons were reported as being average and more as below average (see Table 16).

## Summary

There were no differences seen in children's functioning in class in the three kinds of schools. Essentially, children were characterized as interested, responsive (except for the lack of spontaneous questions), and fluent, and as relating well to each other.

## TABLE 16

## DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR FOR PUPIL FUNCTIONING, MES 1967 AND 1968, IN PER CENT

| | MES Only | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Above | | Average | | Below | |
| Characteristic | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 |
| Children's interest and enthusiasm | 51 | 54 | 30 | 17 | 19 | 29 |
| Children volunteered in response to teacher's questions | 50 | 41 | 20 | 24 | 30 | 35 |
| Children raised questions | 7 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 84 | 90 |
| Overall participation of children | 76 | 76 | 9 | 8 | 15 | 16 |
| Overall verbal fluency of children who participated | 22 | 75 | 42 | 25 | 36 | 0 |

## CHAPTER VI

## PUPIL ACADEMIC FUNCTIONING: ELEMENTARY GRADES

Data on children in grades 2-6 were obtained in three major academic areas: arithmetic, reading, and verbal fluency. As noted earlier in Chapter II (Procedure) the arithmetic data come from the citywide administration of the subtest in arithmetic problem solving of the Metropolitan Achievement Test in grade 3 and the Iowa Basic Skills Test in grades 4 and 6. The reading data come from the administration of the MAT subtests in reading to grades 2-6 and from the evaluation staff's administration of a test in oral reading, described earlier, to a sample of children in the third grade. Finally, the data on verbal fluency come from the evaluation staff's administration of measures of the child's ability to speak and to understand when spoken to, also administered to children in the third grade.

### Ability in Arithmetic

The data on current functioning levels in arithmetic problem solving are presented in Table 17. Since the Old and New ME schools had identical medians in grade 4 and were only .1 of a grade apart at grade 3, data are presented for all ME schools combined in these grades, but separately for grade 6 where they were .4 of a year apart. It is immediately apparent by reference to the row headed "Status in Relation to Norms" that retardation characterized all grades in all three kinds of schools. At grade 3, MES and SS children were reasonably close to normal expectation, with MES children .4 of a year and the SS children .3 below expectation, on the average. The C children were already one-half year behind by grade three. In grade 4, retardation was more severe but the grade 3 pattern held: ME and SS schools were comparable (.7 and .8 below expectation), with the C schools further behind (-1.0). At grade 6, all three types of schools evidenced retardation: one and one-half years in the New ME and the C schools and of almost two years in the Old ME (1.9) and SS schools (1.8). Specifically comparing ME and C schools only, the observed data indicate less severe retardation in ME schools at grades 3 and 4 but not at grade 6, where the Old ME schools were more severely retarded and the New ME schools did not differ.

Since the ME and C schools were established as pairs, the more thorough comparison is provided in Table 18, which compares the median level of arithmetic achievement in each pair. Considering all grades, the pattern in the 15 differences, in which the ME school achieved the higher level 9 times and the C school 6 times, is not statistically significantly different from the 7½-7½ pattern one would expect by chance.

### The Comparisons at the Extremes of the Distribution of Achievement

In addition to comparing achievement levels in the center of the distribution through the medians, the evaluation staff compared the ME and C schools at the extremes of the distribution through examination of the relative achievement of children at the third quartile (the highest

## TABLE 17

## GRADE EQUIVALENTS IN ARITHMETIC--SPRING, 1968: MEDIANS, STATUS IN RELATION TO NORMS, AND RANGE: BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL, MAT GRADE 3,[a] IOWA GRADES 4 AND 6[b]

| Statistic | Grade | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3 | | | 4 | | | 6 | | | |
| | MES | C | SS | MES | C | SS | MES | | C | SS |
| | | | | | | | Old | New | | |
| Median | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 4.8 |
| Status in Relation to Norms | -.4 | -.5 | -.3 | -.7 | -1.0 | -.8 | -1.9 | -1.5 | -1.5 | -1.8 |
| Lowest School Median | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 4.4 |
| Highest School Median | 3.9 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.3 |
| Range | 1.0 | .7 | 1.3 | 1.1 | .6 | .6 | .6 | .6 | .3 | .9 |

[a] MAT-Problem Solving and Concepts

[b] Iowa-Problem Solving

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF MEDIAN ARITHMETIC GRADE EQUIVALENTS
IN PAIRED ME AND CONTROL SCHOOLS, BY GRADE, MARCH 1968

| | | Median Arithmetic Grade Level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair | School Type | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 6[a] | |
| A | ME | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.9 | |
| | C | 3.3 | 3.6 | 5.2 | |
| B | ME | 2.8 | 3.9 | a | |
| | C | 2.8 | 3.0 | | |
| C | ME | 3.4 | 4.1 | a | |
| | C | 2.8 | 3.6 | | |
| D | ME | 3.3 | 4.0 | 5.1 | |
| | C | 2.8 | 3.2 | 4.9 | |
| E | ME | 3.0 | 3.7 | a | |
| | C | 3.1 | 3.6 | | |
| F | ME | 2.9 | 3.8 | a | |
| | C | 3.4 | 3.8 | | |
| G | ME | 3.2 | 4.1 | 4.8 | |
| | C | 3.5 | 4.2 | 5.2 | |
| | | | | | Total |
| Number of times MES was higher | | 3 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| Number of times C school was higher | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Number of times no difference | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |

[a] Sixth grade data were not available for one or both of the schools in these pairs.

---

achieving 25 per cent), and the first quartile (the lowest-achieving 25 per cent). The quartiles appear in Table 19.

At both the upper (third quartile) and the lower (first quartile) ends of the distribution, the pattern was comparable to that for the medians: there was no evidence of differential functioning in arithmetic by children in the ME as compared to the paired Control schools.

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF FIRST AND THIRD QUARTILES IN ARITHMETIC ACHIEVEMENT IN PAIRED ME AND CONTROL SCHOOLS, BY GRADE, MARCH 1968

| Pair | School Type | Third Quartile | | | | First Quartile | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3 | 4 | 6[a] | | 3 | 4 | 6[a] | |
| A | MES | 4.4 | 3.6 | 5.6 | | 3.2 | 3.6 | 4.1 | |
| | C | 4.1 | 4.6 | 6.1 | | 2.7 | 2.9 | 4.1 | |
| B | MES | 3.3 | 4.9 | a | | 2.5 | 3.5 | a | |
| | C | 3.3 | 3.9 | | | 2.5 | 2.4 | | |
| C | MES | 4.1 | 5.4 | a | | 2.8 | 3.6 | a | |
| | C | 3.4 | 4.6 | | | 2.4 | 3.0 | | |
| D | MES | 4.1 | 5.1 | 5.7 | | 2.7 | 3.4 | 4.3 | |
| | C | 3.4 | 4.2 | 5.3 | | 2.5 | 2.7 | 3.4 | |
| E | MES | 3.7 | 4.6 | a | | 2.5 | 3.3 | a | |
| | C | 3.1 | 4.8 | | | 2.6 | 3.0 | | |
| F | MES | 3.3 | 4.8 | a | | 2.6 | 3.1 | a | |
| | C | 4.1 | 4.0 | | | 2.8 | 3.6 | | |
| G | MES | 3.8 | 5.3 | 5.6 | | 2.7 | 3.6 | 4.0 | |
| | C | 4.0 | 5.4 | 5.9 | | 3.0 | 3.8 | 4.3 | |
| | | | | | Total | | | | Total |
| No. of times ME school higher | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| No. of times C school higher | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| No. of times no difference | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |

[a] Sixth grade data were not available for one or both of the schools in these pairs.

## Comparing 1967 and 1968

Table 20 presents the data for the ME schools in March 1967 and in March 1968 in arithmetic.[1] In the six comparisons possible with these data (see Column 8), there was no change in one instance, a drop in four instances (of .2, .2, .4, and.5), and an increase in one instance (of .1). While all of these changes were statistically significant with the large number of children involved, only the drops in the ME schools in the sixth grade would be educationally significant. In evaluating these changes, one must allow for the fact that the test used in grades 4 and 6 in 1968 was a different test from that used in 1967, and the grade equivalents may not be perfectly comparable. Since this may, in part, explain the drops, the evaluation staff has not concluded that retardation has increased, but rather that, in terms of this measure, in 1967-68 the ME schools made no progress in alleviating pupil retardation in arithmetic.

## Three Year Profile of Achievement in Arithmetic

By combining the MES evaluation data previously published by the Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education with those from the immediately previous and current evaluations conducted by the Center for Urban Education, achievement profiles in arithmetic can be developed for grades 4 and 6 covering three testing periods: May 1966, March 1967, and March 1968. Since the original testing was in May, the data presented in Table 20 present these May 1966 scores, and the actual scores for March 1967 and March 1968. This table also presents the estimated scores for May 1967 and May 1968, obtained by simply adding .2 to the actual March score. Since the children were not progressing at normal rates, this procedure slightly overestimates their arithmetic achievement, but does not seriously distort the data, particularly in view of the lack of change indicated. The data in Column 9 of Table 20 indicate that, despite this slight inflation of 1967 and 1968 achievement levels, the median achievement levels in the Old ME schools were .2 of a year lower in 1968 than in 1966 at grades 4 and 6. For the New ME schools, neither grade 4 nor grade 6 had changed.

Thus, the overall conclusion is that no change in level of arithmetic achievement had occurred in the New ME schools, and despite an observed drop, no educationally significant change occurred in the Old ME schools.

## Achievement in Reading: Standardized Tests

Achievement in reading on standardized tests was estimated through the analysis of the citywide reading tests (MAT) administered in ME, C, and SS schools in April 1968. Since the Board of Education did not administer citywide tests in October 1968, as had been done in previous Octobers, no comparable estimates[2] of reading achievement at the beginning of the year were available to us.

---

[1] The data in this table for 1966 will be discussed in the next section, as well as the data in the "Estimated" columns for May 1967 and May 1968.

[2] The New York State Education Department administered reading tests in October 1968 but these yielded percentiles rather than grade equivalents.

# TABLE 20

## PROFILES OF MEDIAN SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT IN ARITHMETIC ACROSS THREE YEARS OF MES, BY GRADE, TYPE OF SCHOOL,[a] SPRING ONLY

| Grade | School Type | May 1966 Actual | March 1967 Actual | May 1967 Projected | March 1968 Actual | May 1968 Projected | Comparisons<br>March 1968 To March 1967 | <br>May 1968 to May 1966 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Old | b | 3.4 | -- | 3.4 | -- | 0 | -- |
| | New | b | 3.5 | -- | 3.5 | -- | -.2 | -- |
| 4 | Old | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.3 | -.2 | -.2 |
| | New | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 | +.1 | 0 |
| 6 | Old | 5.8 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 5.6 | -.4 | -.2 |
| | New | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 5.1 | 5.3 | -.5 | 0 |

---

[a] The reader is reminded that all 21 ME schools are included in this analysis to maintain comparability of the 1968 data to those previously reported.

[b] No data were reported in the 1966 study for Grade 3.

## Current Status of Achievement in Reading

Table 21 presents, by grade, the medians, status in relationship to norms, and the range in school medians for ME, C, and SS schools. Grade 6 data are reported for the Old and New ME schools separately, since the difference in median achievement was .7, with the New ME schools higher.[3] In the third grade the medians in the Old and New ME schools were identical; in the fourth and fifth grades they were .1 of a grade apart, and in the second grade they were .2 of a year apart, with the New ME schools always higher. Generally, then, the fact that some schools had the MES program for four years and others for three was not reflected in educationally significant differences in reading levels achieved by the children in April 1968, except for the differences in the sixth grade favoring the New ME schools. And of course, all these differences in favor of the New ME schools are opposite to what would be expected if the amount of experience in the program constituted a significant factor affecting reading.

Reference to the row "Status in Relation to Norms" indicates that in both Old and New ME schools we have the unhappily familiar picture of retardation at all grades except grade two. Initially, at grade two the picture is good, for the ME schools are only .1 below grade. However, retardation at grade three is .5, at grade four .7, at grade five 1.0, and at grade six 1.5 for the Old and .8 for the New ME schools.

Comparing the grouped data for the ME schools to those for the C and SS schools, in grades two, three, four, and five the ME schools have higher reading levels than either comparison group. The differences are greater in comparison to the C schools, either .3 or .4, whereas in comparison to the SS schools, the differences were .1 for grades four and five, .2 for grade three, and the one large difference (.5) at grade two.

At grade six, the New ME schools were also doing better than either the C (+.4) or SS (+.7) schools, but the Old ME schools were achieving at the same level as the SS, and .3 lower than the C schools.

The comparison for the pairs of ME and C schools is provided by the data in Table 22, which reinforce the generalization drawn from the data in Table 21: in 20 of the 29 instances in which a difference occurred, the difference indicated superior performance by the children in the ME school, a pattern which differs significantly from chance. The importance of school is reflected in the fact that,in four of the seven pairs,the children in the ME school achieved higher reading grades in all grades studied, and in two instances the children in the C school did (except for grade 6 in pair G). Only in pair A was there inconsistency. In grade two, the ME schools was dramatically higher by one year. At grade three the difference was only .4 of a year, and by grade four was .1. Then the pattern reversed at grade five, where the C school was .4 higher, and dropped in magnitude at grade six where the C school was only .1 higher.

---

[3] There were only 3 Old and 4 New ME schools with sixth grades included in the schools in this evaluation.

## TABLE 21

### GRADE EQUIVALENTS IN READING: MEDIANS, STATUS IN RELATION TO NORMS, AND RANGE: BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL
### APRIL 1968

|  | G R A D E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |
| Statistic | ME | C | SS | ME | C | SS | ME | C | SS | ME | C | SS | ME<br>Old[a] | ME<br>New[b] | C[c] | SS[d] |
| Median | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 5.2 |
| Status in Relation to Norms | -.1 | -.5 | -.6 | -.5 | -.8 | -.7 | -.7 | -1.1 | -.8 | -1.0 | -1.3 | -1.1 | -1.5 | -.8 | -1.2 | -1.5 |
| Lowest School Median | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.1 | a | 5.3 | c | 4.5 |
| Highest School Median | 3.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | a | 7.0 | c | 6.0 |

---

[a] Three schools, so no range reported.

[b] Four schools.

[c] Three schools had sixth grades but because of a use of answer sheets requiring hand scoring, in one school data were available for only two of these schools. Therefore, no range is reported.

[d] Four schools.

## TABLE 22

## COMPARISON OF MEDIAN READING GRADE EQUIVALENTS IN PAIRED ME AND CONTROL SCHOOLS, BY GRADE, APRIL 1968

| | | Median Reading Grade Level | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair | School Type | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | |
| A | ME | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 5.3 | |
| | C | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 5.4 | |
| B | ME | 2.2 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 4.8 | [a] | |
| | C | 1.8 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 4.3 | | |
| C | ME | 2.4 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 4.4 | [a] | |
| | C | 1.9 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 3.7 | | |
| D | ME | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 4.8 | [a] | |
| | C | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 4.7 | | |
| E | ME | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 4.9 | [a] | |
| | C | 1.9 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 4.3 | | |
| F | ME | 2.0 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 4.2 | [a] | |
| | C | 2.1 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.3 | | |
| G | ME | 2.2 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 5.8 | |
| | C | 2.4 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 5.6 | |
| | | | | | | | Total |
| Number of times ME school higher | | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 20 |
| Number of times C school higher | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| Number of times no difference | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

---

[a] Sixth grade data were not available for one or both of the schools in these pairs.

## The Comparison at the Extremes of the Distribution of Achievement

Table 23 presents the first and third quartiles for the seven pairs of ME and Control schools. The data indicate that at the first quartile there were the same statistically significant differences just discussed for the medians, indicative of higher reading levels in the ME schools. However, at the third quartile, the pattern of differences did not differ significantly from chance. These data in Table 23 when combined with those from Table 22 indicate that in the ME schools, children at the lower end and middle of the distribution of ability were doing better than their peers in the matched C school, but children at the upper end of the distribution were not.

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF FIRST AND THIRD QUARTILES IN
READING ACHIEVEMENT IN PAIRED ME AND CONTROL SCHOOLS,
BY GRADE, APRIL 1968

| Pair | School Type | Third Quartile | | | | | | First Quartile | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total |
| A | ME | 4.5 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 6.0 | | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 3.7 | 4.6 | |
| | C | 3.6 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 5.7 | 7.4 | | 2.0 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 | |
| B | ME | 2.6 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 5.6 | a | | 1.8 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 4.1 | a | |
| | C | 2.1 | 2.6 | 3.9 | 5.1 | | | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.9 | 3.5 | | |
| C | ME | 3.2 | 4.2 | 5.9 | 5.6 | a | | 2.0 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.5 | a | |
| | C | 2.4 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 4.7 | | | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | | |
| D | ME | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 6.3 | a | | 2.1 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 3.8 | a | |
| | C | 2.9 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 5.8 | | | 1.9 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 4.0 | | |
| E | ME | 3.2 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 5.8 | a | | 2.0 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 4.0 | a | |
| | C | 2.6 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 5.4 | | | 1.6 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 3.4 | | |
| F | ME | 2.4 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 4.9 | a | | 1.7 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 3.6 | a | |
| | C | 3.0 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 5.2 | | | 1.7 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 3.5 | | |
| G | ME | 2.8 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 5.7 | 7.1 | | 1.8 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.8 | |
| | C | 3.1 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 7.8 | | 2.0 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 4.6 | |
| Number of times ME school higher | | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 23 |
| Number of times C school higher | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of times no difference | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

[a] Sixth grade data were not available for one or both of the schools in these pairs.

## Comparing 1967 and 1968

Table 24 presents data by which comparisons can be made between levels of reading achievement in April 1967 and April 1968. These comparisons are presented in column 8 of the table. They indicate that 1967-68 was a year in which some limited progress was evidenced in reading achievement at the upper elementary grades, for both Old and New ME schools improved in grades 4, 5, and 6. However, half of the six changes were limited in magnitude (.1 or .2 of a year). Both declined at grade 3 and the Old declined and the New improved at grade 2, with all of these changes of limited magnitude.(.1 or .2).

## Four Year Profile of Achievement in Reading

The data in Table 24 also permit the evaluation of the status of the ME schools in reading in 1968 in comparison to 1965 for the Old and to 1966 for the New ME schools. For this comparison, the estimated reading levels for May 1968 must be used. For the Old ME schools, little change is evident, for in comparison to levels achieved in May 1965 (the end of the first year of the MES program), the scores of children currently in grades three and five are not different, the scores of children currently in grade six are worse (-.4), and the scores in grades two and four are slightly better (+.2). In contrast, in comparison to May 1966, the children in the New ME schools in 1968 were reading substantially higher (+.4 to +.6) in every grade except grade three, which had not changed.

## The Impact of Consecutive MES Education

In the 1966-67 evaluation of the MES program, it was noted that children who had spent their entire school life in the ME school they were currently attending,read better than those who had only partial exposure to the MES program. While this kind of analysis is confounded in part by the fact that the children with less than complete MES histories are also the more mobile children who have changed schools more often, the finding was considered sufficiently significant to merit replicating the analysis. Table 25 then presents the reading data for grades 3, 4, and 5 for the Old and New ME schools, separately for children in each grade who have attended the school for the total period of the MES program, and those who have attended for only part of that program.

As in 1966-67, in every comparison,the children with "full" MES histories read better than those with the partial histories, whether the comparison was in terms of the medians (columns 5 and 6) or the per cent of children who were reading at or above grade level (columns 7 and 8). Since the differences in the per cent of children reading close to grade level were also in favor of the children with "full" MES, the largest differences are seen in the last two columns of Table 25, which report the percentage of children reading one year or more below grade level. Here the differences are at least 10 per cent and as much as 17 per cent.

## TABLE 24

### PROFILES OF MEDIAN SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT IN READING ACROSS FOUR YEARS OF MES BY GRADE, TYPE OF ME SCHOOL[1], SPRING ONLY

| Grade | Type of School | May '65 | May '66 | April '67 | April '68 | Projected May '68 | Comparison April '68 & April '67 | Comparison May '68 & May 65 | Comparison May '68 & May '66 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Old ME | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | -.1 | +.2 | X |
|  | New | X | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.9 | +.2 | X | +.5 |
| 3 | Old ME | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.4 | -.2 | 0 | X |
|  | New | X | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.4 | -.1 | X | 0 |
| 4 | OlD ME | 4.1 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 4.3 | +.3 | +.2 | X |
|  | New | X | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.3 | +.2 | X | +.6 |
| 5 | Old ME | 5.1 | 5.2 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 5.0 | +.4 | -.1 | X |
|  | New | X | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.9 | +.2 | X | +.4 |
| 6 | Old ME | 6.1 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 5.7 | +.1 | -.4 | X |
|  | New | X | 5.3 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 5.9 | +.3 | X | +.6 |

---

[1] The reaaer is reminded that all 21 ME schools are included in this analysis to maintain comparability of the 1968 data to those previously reported.

X+ No data appropriate for this interval.

## TABLE 25

## COMPARISON OF READING ACHIEVEMENT OF CHILDREN WITH FULL OR PARTIAL MES SCHOOL HISTORIES, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL AND GRADE MEDIANS, AND STATUS IN RELATIONSHIP TO GRADE LEVEL

| Grade | Type of School | N | | Median | | Percentage at or above grade level | | Percentage 1 yr. or less below grade level | | Percentage more than 1 yr. below grade level | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | P[a] | F[b] | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F |
| 5 | Old | 491 | 469 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 17 | 25 | 16 | 19 | 67 | 56 |
| 5 | New | 349 | 340 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 33 | 45 | 36 | 38 | 31 | 17 |
| 4 | Old | 499 | 519 | 3.7 | 4.4 | 17 | 24 | 24 | 34 | 59 | 42 |
| 4 | New | 437 | 292 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 22 | 31 | 27 | 28 | 51 | 41 |
| 3 | Old | 329 | 720 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 50 | 40 |
| 3 | New | 387 | 467 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 24 | 27 | 30 | 37 | 46 | 36 |

[a] P=Partial MES history

[b] F=Full MES history

### Summary

Obviously the data from the citywide standardized tests in reading achievement are not completely consistent, for the positive findings are qualified by parallel negative ones. For example, the children in the ME schools in 1968 were reading at levels higher than those achieved by children in the C or SS schools, but were still seriously below expectations, particularly from grade four on. The ME children consistently achieved a higher level of reading achievement at the lower end of the distribution of achievement, but not at the higher end. Grades four and five showed higher reading scores in 1968 than in 1967, but nothing changed in grade three. The New ME schools showed significant improvement when 1968 was compared to the end of their first year (1966), but the Old ME schools showed no comparable improvement and declines at grades five and six when compared to the end of their first year (1965). The one consistently positive finding is that, in 1967-68 as in 1966-67, the children with continuous exposure to the MES program read better than those with only partial exposure at all grades and in both Old and New ME schools.

## Achievement in Reading: Informal Oral Reading

In an effort to obtain a different basis for comparing the reading ability of the children in ME, C, and SS schools, the evaluation team administered to a sample of third-grade children a test of ability to read aloud and to comprehend what was read. As was noted in Chapter II, this test was intended to provide the basis for a comparative judgment on the ability of children in the three kinds of schools. It was not intended to provide any quantitative estimate of reading grade or level.

The test consisted of a passage in a reader appropriate for the grade. As the child read the passage the examiner recorded errors. After the child had read the passage he was asked four questions to test his understanding of vocabulary used in the passage, his direct comprehension of the passage, and his ability to reason beyond the passage.

Table 26 presents the distribution of errors and the median number of errors made in reading the passage by the 60 ME and the 60 paired C and SS children to whom the test was administered. In terms of both the distribution and the medians, the data indicate no statistically significant differences among the children in ME and C schools, and in fact little observed differences as well. The median number of errors in each group was about 5 (5.4 and 5.1), with the distribution going up to the interval 41-50 for ME children and to 51-60 for the C children. The SS children made fewer errors on the average (3.5), but they too included a cluster of children who made many errors, up to and including 41-50.

The simple direct comparison of performance is to consider the pairs of children tested. Of the 60 pairs, there were differences in the total number of errors in 56 instances. Of these, the MES child made fewer errors 26 times, the C or SS child 30 times; not different from expectation.

Further evidence of the near identity of the results of this phase of the oral reading tests is provided in Table 27, which indicates the results of comparing each pair of children in terms of the pattern of superiority. There were differences in 56 of the 60 pairs, but the instances in which the ME child was superior in one or more of the subscores were paralleled by instances in which an SS or C child was superior for the same subscores.

In addition to being asked to read the passage aloud, the children were asked to answer four questions about the passage. The distribution of scores on this phase of the oral reading tests appears in Table 28. The data for this phase of the test, as for the first phase, indicate basically identical performance by the children in the ME, C, and SS schools. In each instance the median number of items correct was 2, and in each instance children clustered about this point, answering 2 or 3 questions correctly, with few children at either extreme. For example, among the ME children,only 2 missed all four questions, and only 4 answered all four correctly. Comparing the pairs, the number of questions answered correctly was identical 15 times. Of the 45 differences,the ME child did better 23 times, the C or SS child 22 times, a distribution as close as possible to chance.

Clearly then, these varied analyses of the data provide no evidence of differences in oral reading ability among the children in the three types of schools toward the end of the year in the third grade.

TABLE 26

DISTRIBUTION OF ERRORS AND MEDIAN NUMBER OF ERRORS ON ORAL READING TEST, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL, PER CENT AT EACH INTERVAL, GRADE 3 ONLY

| No. of Errors | ME | C | SS |
|---|---|---|---|
| 51-60 | | 4 | |
| 41-50 | 2 | | 3 |
| 31-40 | | | 3 |
| 21-30 | 8 | 7 | 6 |
| 16-20 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| 11-15 | 3 | | 6 |
| 10 | 2 | 4 | |
| 9 | 7 | 4 | |
| 8 | 12 | 7 | 3 |
| 7 | 3 | 10 | 10 |
| 6 | 5 | 7 | 6 |
| 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| 4 | 8 | 25 | 3 |
| 3 | 10 | | 22 |
| 2 | 13 | 7 | 16 |
| 1 | 10 | 10 | 3 |
| 0 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| N | 60 | 29 | 31 |
| $Q_3$ | 9.07 | 8.21 | 7.83 |
| Median | 5.4 | 5.1 | 3.5 |
| $Q_1$ | 2.42 | 3.66 | 2.31 |

## TABLE 27

## COMPARISON OF MES CHILDREN TO PAIRED C OR SS CHILDREN ON SUB-SCORES OF ORAL READING TEST, WHEN CHILDREN DIFFERED (N=60 PAIRS)

| Child Doing Better | All 4 Scores | 3 Scores: all but: | | | | Two Scores as Indicated | | | | | | 1 Score Only | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N[a] | A[b] | O[c] | E[d] | N,A | N,O | N,E | A,O, | A,E | O,E | N | A | O | E | |
| MES | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 26 |
| C or SS | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 30 |

[a] - Nonrecognition errors

[b] - Addition errors

[c] - Omission errors

[d] - Endings errors

## TABLE 28

## FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND MEDIAN FOR NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ANSWERED CORRECTLY ON THE ORAL READING TEST, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL, AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN

| | Number of Children Type of School | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Items Correct | ME | C/SS | C | SS |
| 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 3 | 21 | 21 | 7 | 14 |
| 2 | 25 | 22 | 10 | 12 |
| 1 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 3 |
| 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Median | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.4 |

## Verbal Fluency

Since one of the stated objectives of the MES program is to improve the verbal fluency of the children, particularly in the early elementary grades, a test to estimate children's ability to understand spoken English as well as to speak English was administered to a sample of third grade classes. This test, as was noted in Chapter II (Procedure), was adapted from two tests originally developed during the course of the Puerto Rican Study. The subtest on Understanding of Spoken English yields two subscores, one estimating the extent to which the child understood the vocabulary used in the test, the second the extent to which he understood the concepts of the test. Table 29 presents the quartile scores for these two subscores and for the total scores.

TABLE 29

QUARTILE OF THIRD GRADE SCORES ON UNDERSTANDING
SUBTESTS OF VERBAL FLUENCY TEST,
BY TYPE OF SCHOOL AND SUBTEST

| | | ME | | ME | Control | Board | Special |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Old | New | All | All | Control | Service |
| | N | 707 | 549 | 1256 | 1408 | 654 | 754 |
| Vocabulary Subtest | $Q_3$ | 13.9 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 13.6 |
| | $Q_2$ | 11.8 | 12.2 | 12.0 | 11.7 | 11.8 | 11.5 |
| | $Q_1$ | 9.7 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 9.3 | 9.6 | 9.1 |
| Concept Subtest | $Q_3$ | 21.7 | 22.1 | 21.9 | 21.3 | 21.5 | 21.3 |
| | $Q_2$ | 19.7 | 19.3 | 19.2 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.7 |
| | $Q_1$ | 16.5 | 16.7 | 16.6 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.6 |
| Total Score | $Q_3$ | 35.9 | 35.8 | 35.2 | 34.7 | 35.0 | 34.4 |
| | $Q_2$ | 31.2 | 31.3 | 31.2 | 30.5 | 30.4 | 30.4 |
| | $Q_1$ | 26.9 | 27.2 | 27.0 | 25.3 | 25.3 | 25.3 |

At all three quartiles (Table 29) the children in the three kinds of schools achieved nearly identical scores, averaging 12 out of the 20 vocabulary items correct and 19 of the 30 concept items, for an average total score of 31 out of the possible 50. The reader should note that the distributions were relatively constricted, with the interquartile range (the number of score points which separate the middle 50 per cent of the group) covering only 4 points for the vocabulary subtest and 6 points for the concept subtest. Examination of the quartile scores indicates that this constriction of the range came about mainly because the test had too many simple items, which even the low scorers were above to get correct. Thus, the first quartile scores for both the vocabulary and concept subtests were at the level of 50 per cent correct.

The verbal fluency test of understanding, like the oral reading test, was intended to provide a basis for comparison rather than to establish a level of understanding. In that context the results are clear: there were no differences among the programs, at any level of ability -- the low, middle, or upper quarters of the achievement distribution.

Verbal Fluency: Production

A second aspect of verbal fluency, of course, is the child's ability to speak. Over the years this has proved to be a more difficult ability to test with any sensitivity, and this evaluation was no exception. As noted in the Procedure chapter, we attempted to estimate the children's ability to speak fluently by showing the child a complex scene of children and adults in a park and asking the child first to describe what he saw, and next to tell a story about one of the people in the picture and what he was doing. The entire production test was recorded on tape.

The first part proved successful in generating a measure that varied and could be objectively quantified. The second part did not. Two scores were generated: one, the simple count of the number of items within the picture that the child identified correctly, and the second, the count of the number of items he identified with a complex language pattern, generally some adjective or adjectival phrase modifying the noun by which the person or activity was identified. The data from these two measures are presented in Tables 30 and 31.

Table 30 indicates that, for production, there were statistically significant differences between the children in the ME and C schools, with the ME children doing better. There was no statistically significant difference between children in the ME and SS schools, although the observed differences here too indicated better performance by the ME children. For example, the ME median was one item higher than the SS median and 2 items higher than the C median, differences which could be dismissed as educationally of limited significance. However, the fact that 45 per cent of the ME children identified 15 or more of the aspects of the picture compared with 34 per cent of the SS and only 18 per cent of the C children indicates a consistent difference, directly reflected in the differences at each quartile.

Table 31 presents the data related to the complexity of expression used by the children when identifying the items in the picture. These data represent the number of qualifiers the children used per item correctly identified. As a glance at the bottom row indicates the medians were nearly identical, with the children averaging about one and one-half qualifiers per item. Despite this lack of difference in the medians, the distributions do reflect a greater clustering at the bottom of the distribution among C and SS children compared to the ME children and a compensating greater clustering among the ME children at the upper end of the distribution: for 46 per cent of the ME children compared to 36 per cent of the C and 29 per cent of the SS children averaged more than one and one-half qualifiers per item.

TABLE 30

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND QUARTILES OF NUMBER OF ITEMS CORRECTLY IDENTIFIED ON PRODUCTION SUBTEST OF VERBAL FLUENCY TEST, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL, IN PER CENT

| Number of Items Identified Correctly | MES | C/SS | C | SS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21-30 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 17-20 | 22 | 11 | 8 | 14 |
| 15-16 | 20 | 9 | 4 | 14 |
| 13-14 | 21 | 24 | 27 | 22 |
| 11-12 | 16 | 25 | 27 | 23 |
| 6-10 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| 1-5 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 1 |
| N | 226 | 158 | 79 | 79 |
| $Q_3$ | 16.5 | 14.7 | 14.0 | 15.8 |
| Median | 14.0 | 12.5 | 12.1 | 13.0 |
| $Q_1$ | 11.4 | 10.5 | 9.8 | 10.8 |

## TABLE 31

## PER CENT OF CHILDREN WITH INDICATED NUMBER OF QUALIFIERS PER ITEM, BY TYPE OF SCHOOL

| Number of Qualifiers Per Item | Per Cent<br>Type of School<br>ME | <br><br>C | <br><br>SS |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3.1-3.9 | * | 0 | 0 |
| 2.6-3.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0-2.5 | 13 | 8 | 6 |
| 1.6-1.9 | 32 | 28 | 23 |
| 1.0-1.5 | 48 | 54 | 52 |
| .6- .9 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| .1- .5 | * | 1 | 2 |
| 0 | * | 8 | 7 |
| Total N | 213 | 75 | 81 |
| Median | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.3 |

*Some, but less than 1 per cent.

# CHAPTER VII

## CHILDREN'S SELF-PERCEPTIONS

The instrument used to evaluate children's self-perceptions[1] was a simple three-part checklist. The child was presented with 20 characteristics of self[2] and a reference to his neighborhood and asked to evaluate each of the 21 aspects three times, first in terms of the extent to which he liked or disliked this aspect of himself, then in terms of whether or not he thought he might improve this aspect, and finally in terms of how he believed he compared with his classmates.

The instrument was analyzed first to yield the distribution of responses for each item on each of the three criteria. These data are summarized here in two ways: the percentages of positive responses for each of the three criteria for the 21 aspects are presented in Table 32, and item medians are presented in Table 33.[3]

Each individual child's responses were scored to yield the number of characteristics which he "strongly liked" about himself, as well as the number he "strongly disliked" about himself. The distribution of these scores appears in Tables 34 and 35. The individual responses were also scored to yield the number of characteristics in which each child believed he might improve. The distribution of these scores appears in Table 36.

Considering first the summary of the responses which appears in Tables 32 and 33, the basic findings are apparent at a glance: children were generally quite pleased with the aspects of self about which we questioned them, felt they compared well to others, and yet still felt they could improve. These generalizations hold with equal force for all four groups of children. The feelings of pleasure are reflected in the finding that at least 65 per cent and as many as 92 per cent of the children responded that they liked these specific aspects of self. They are reinforced by the finding that at least 46 per cent and as many as 74 per cent felt that they were above average for the aspect in comparison with their classmates. Similarly (Table 33), the item medians in every instance are in the interval 1 to 2, meaning that 50 per cent of each group indicated the maximum or next to maximum degree of positive rating.

The comparability of perceptions of children in the different kinds of schools is seen in the limited range in the proportions of positive responses. For example, considering the data on "like this aspect of self," the range within any of the 21 items is never more than 10 per cent, and is 6 per cent or less for half of them.

---

[1] In addition to being used in the ME, C, and SS schools, this instrument was administered in the evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment Program both to the children being bussed (O.E.) and the children who resided in the neighborhood of the receiving school, i.e., the resident children.

[2] The reader is reminded that the characteristics included were selected from the content analysis categories used in Jersild's study.

[3] These medians were obtained by treating the distributions as five-point ordinal scales (with 1.0 assigned to the most positive point).

In light of this positive self-perception, the data in Tables 34, 35, and 36 are not surprising. They indicate that on the average (median) the children in each program strongly liked 12 to 14 of the 21 characteristics we listed, and strongly disliked no more than one (.9). Their feelings of being able to do even better are clearly reflected in the data in Table 36, which indicate that, on the average, they felt that they can still improve in 17 or 18 of the 21 characteristics, with at least 80 per cent of each group believing they can improve in more than half of the 21 characteristics.

It is of some interest to note the size of the majorities of children in each type of school who believe in their ability to improve in each of the aspects of self which we studied. In only one of the 76 bits of data presented in the middle columns of Table 32 is the percentage believing in the ability to improve below 70 per cent, and that one is 68 per cent. In view of the suggestion by Coleman in Equality of Educational Opportunity that a child's belief in his capacity to affect his environment and future is a critical dimension in school achievement this finding is particularly positive. For to the extent that these questions on this inventory reflect that kind of belief, the children in all four kinds of school settings expressed consistently strong belief in just such abilities.

When one turns to comparing the ME, C, SS, and OE children, the data are not completely consistent. The proportions of positive responses were compared using a sign test to determine the statistical significance of any differences. The data presented in Table 32 were used to generate nine sign tests, comparing ME and C children, ME and SS children, and ME and OE children, on each of the three criteria. These results are summarized in Table 37.

The data indicate that significantly more often when compared to MES children, the C, and O.E. children had the higher proportion of positive responses for "self-appraisal" and the C, SS, and O.E. children for the "belief they may improve," but that there were no statistically significant differences in any comparison for "comparison with classmates."

But these data, we believe, illustrate well the difference between statistical significance and what we have called practical or educational significance, for by reference to Tables 32, 33, and 34, the reader can see that the differences being evaluated here were small (often only 1 per cent or 2 per cent) and since all groups had clearly positive perceptions, the evaluation team does not believe these findings of "differences" should obscure the previously noted comparable aspects of the data, particularly that all children had positive self-perceptions and a clear belief they could improve.

## TABLE 32

## PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WITH POSITIVE PERCEPTIONS OF SELF, OF ABILITY TO IMPROVE, AND OF POSITIVE STATUS IN RELATIONSHIP TO OTHERS, BY GROUP

| Characteristic | Percentage Who Like This Aspect of Self | | | | Percentage Who Believe May Improve This Aspect | | | | Percentage Who Believe They Are Better than Most for This Aspect | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MES | C | SS | OE[a] | MES | C | SS | OE | MES | C | SS | OE |
| The Way I Dress | 87 | 88 | 89 | 92 | 76 | 77 | 89 | 82 | 65 | 67 | 63 | 67 |
| Ability to Have Fun | 85 | 87 | 91 | 90 | 71 | 73 | 86 | 71 | 69 | 72 | 73 | 74 |
| Personal Neatness and Cleanliness | 84 | 90 | 91 | 89 | 80 | 80 | 88 | 86 | 67 | 66 | 72 | 63 |
| Ability to Help Others | 83 | 87 | 88 | 92 | 74 | 75 | 82 | 80 | 66 | 66 | 70 | 68 |
| Ability to Make Friends at School | 83 | 86 | 82 | 90 | 73 | 73 | 77 | 76 | 67 | 66 | 67 | 64 |
| Ability to do Things by Myself | 83 | 85 | 84 | 89 | 72 | 74 | 78 | 77 | 69 | 64 | 66 | 67 |
| Recreational Activities | 83 | 86 | 86 | 88 | b | b | b | b | 69 | 67 | 71 | 70 |
| Participation in School Activities | 82 | 82 | 83 | 86 | 73 | 74 | 82 | 75 | 62 | 58 | 62 | 61 |
| Ability to Get Along with My Teachers | 82 | 87 | 78 | 83 | 73 | 79 | 70 | 75 | 68 | 67 | 57 | 60 |
| My Manners | 81 | 83 | 86 | 90 | 75 | 76 | 84 | 81 | 63 | 62 | 70 | 64 |
| Ability to Get Along with Other Children | 81 | 84 | 83 | 89 | 74 | 72 | 79 | 78 | 62 | 60 | 65 | 63 |

Table 32 (Continued)

| Characteristic | Percentage Who Like This Aspect of Self | | | | Percentage Who Believe May Improve This Aspect | | | | Percentage Who Believe They Are Better than Most for This Aspect | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MES | C | SS | OE[a] | MES | C | SS | OE | MES | C | SS | OE |
| My Ability to Get Along with Adults | 80 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 70 | 73 | 80 | 80 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 |
| My Size | 80 | 78 | 85 | 83 | 79 | 84 | 88 | 88 | 52 | 52 | 60 | 46 |
| Physical Ability | 79 | 82 | 83 | 86 | 75 | 78 | 85 | 83 | 58 | 57 | 60 | 55 |
| Ability to Read | 79 | 81 | 84 | 83 | 71 | 74 | 79 | 82 | 61 | 60 | 64 | 54 |
| My Looks | 78 | 82 | 79 | 87 | 73 | 76 | 83 | 80 | 54 | 55 | 50 | 56 |
| Ability to Study | 78 | 78 | 81 | 76 | 75 | 77 | 85 | 82 | 58 | 66 | 62 | 49 |
| Ability to do Arithmetic | 77 | 75 | 74 | 71 | 70 | 75 | 74 | 79 | 60 | 57 | 58 | 53 |
| My School | 75 | 77 | 67 | 71 | 70 | 72 | 72 | 68 | 59 | 59 | 55 | 50 |
| My Grades | 74 | 78 | 79 | 74 | 74 | 80 | 84 | 86 | 59 | 57 | 59 | 51 |
| My Neighborhood | 66 | 69 | 65 | 75 | b | b | b | b | 48 | 51 | 46 | 57 |
| Mean Percentage | 80.0 | 82.0 | 82.0 | 84.3 | 73.6 | 76.0 | 81.3 | 79.4 | 63.0 | 61.7 | 62.7 | 59.7 |
| No. of Children | 1046 | 605 | 144 | 381 | | | | | | | | |

[a] These data were obtained during the 1967-68 evaluation of the Free Choice Open Enrollment program.

[b] No rating made here.

## TABLE 33

## MEDIAN RATINGS* FOR SELF RATING ASPECTS OF SELF, BY PROGRAM

| Characteristic | MES | C | SS | OE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The way I dress | 1.29 | 1.28 | 1.25 | 1.27 |
| Ability to have fun | 1.80 | 1.19 | 1.09 | 1.16 |
| Personal neatness and cleanliness | 1.32 | 1.28 | 1.31 | 1.38 |
| Ability to help others | 1.33 | 1.29 | 1.26 | 1.32 |
| Ability to make friends at schools | 1.28 | 1.27 | 1.33 | 1.29 |
| Ability to do things by myself | 1.33 | 1.31 | 1.25 | 1.32 |
| Recreational activities | 1.22 | 1.20 | 1.16 | 1.20 |
| Participation in school activities | 1.44 | 1.56 | 1.32 | 1.44 |
| Ability to get along with my teachers | 1.39 | 1.38 | 1.60 | 1.44 |
| My manners | 1.48 | 1.39 | 1.44 | 1.46 |
| Ability to get along with other children | 1.43 | 1.44 | 1.63 | 1.33 |
| Ability to get along with adults | 1.46 | 1.44 | 1.48 | 1.44 |
| My size | 1.48 | 1.46 | 1.32 | 1.61 |
| My physical ability | 1.44 | 1.50 | 1.36 | 1.44 |
| Ability to read | 1.44 | 1.39 | 1.50 | 1.41 |
| My looks | 1.60 | 1.59 | 1.59 | 1.60 |
| Ability to study | 1.60 | 1.63 | 1.44 | 1.80 |
| Ability to do arithmetic | 1.50 | 1.54 | 1.54 | 1.72 |
| My school | 1.46 | 1.57 | 1.85 | 1.93 |
| My grades | 1.67 | 1.60 | 1.41 | 1.91 |
| My neighborhood | 1.74 | 1.67 | 1.92 | 1.43 |

*Based on an assumed five-point ordinal scale, with 1.0 the most positive rating.

### TABLE 34

### NUMBER OF THINGS STRONGLY LIKE ABOUT SELF, PER CENT AT EACH INTERVAL FOR EACH GROUP

| | MES | C | SS | O.E. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19-21 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 7 |
| 17-18 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 9 |
| 15-16 | 14 | 13 | 15 | 12 |
| 13-14 | 15 | 13 | 19 | 15 |
| 11-12 | 13 | 18 | 7 | 17 |
| 9-10 | 12 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| 7-8 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 11 |
| 4-6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 9 |
| 1-3 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 |
| None | 6 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Total N | 1046 | 605 | 144 | 381 |
| Median | 12.3 | 11.8 | 14.0 | 11.7 |

### TABLE 35

### NUMBER OF THINGS STRONGLY DISLIKE ABOUT SELF, PER CENT AT EACH INTERVAL FOR EACH GROUP

| | MES | C | SS | O.E. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9-10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7-8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 4-6 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 1-3 | 37 | 39 | 41 | 38 |
| None | 58 | 57 | 51 | 59 |
| Total N | 1046 | 605 | 144 | 381 |
| Median | .9 | .9 | .9 | .9 |

## TABLE 36

## NUMBER OF THINGS ABOUT SELF "THINK I MAY MAKE IMPROVEMENT," PER CENT AT EACH INTERVAL FOR EACH GROUP

| | MES | C | SS | O.E. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19-21 | 34 | 34 | 44 | 39 |
| 17-18 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 18 |
| 15-16 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 11 |
| 13-14 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 11 |
| 11-12 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 8 |
| 9-10 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 |
| 7-8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 4-6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1-3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| None | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Total N | 1046 | 605 | 144 | 381 |
| Median | 16.7 | 16.7 | 17.9 | 17.3 |

## TABLE 37

## DISTRIBUTION OF DIFFERENCES IN PERCENTAGE HOLDING POSITIVE SELF-PERCEPTION WHEN THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE

| Comparison Between | | Per Cent of Time | | Comparison For |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | B | A Better | B Better | |
| MES | C | 11 | 89 | Self Appraisal |
| | | 6 | 94 | Believe May Improve |
| | | 61 | 39 | Comparison With Classmates |
| MES | SS | 76 | 24 | Self Appraisal |
| | | 5 | 95 | Believe May Improve |
| | | 37 | 63 | Comparison With Classmates |
| MES | OE | 15 | 85 | Self Appraisal |
| | | 6 | 94 | Believe May Improve |
| | | 52 | 48 | Comparison With Classmates |

Another aspect of self-perception is reflected in the ordering of the items presented in Table 32, for they are listed in descending order by the proportion of ME children who had positive perceptions for this aspect. Reading these down, one sees that the characteristics for which children had the highest proportion of positive perceptions were those which would be considered physical, social, or interpersonal, including such physical characteristics as dress and personal neatness, and such abilities as having fun, making friends at school, getting along with other children, and helping others. In contrast, at the bottom of the list appear characteristics which would be considered academic: school, grades, and ability to study and to do arithmetic.[4] In considering this aspect of the data, however, the reader should not forget that we are discussing ranked data, and that even for those characteristics which ranked relatively low,the proportion of MES children who had positive perceptions of themselves never dropped below 74 per cent.[5]

## Summary

These data on self-perception indicate that the four groups had consistently positive perceptions of themselves for the characteristics we studied. Moreover, they all felt that they had good ability to improve and to do even better in the future. Differences did exist, in a consistent pattern: each of the comparison groups (C, SS, and O.E. children) had higher proportions of positive self-appraisals than the ME children, but since these differences were numerically small, the evaluation staff has concluded that all groups had comparably positive self-perceptions.

Within this generalization of positiveness, the children in each of the groups also evidenced a better sense of self in the social and interpersonal areas than in the academic areas.

---

[4] A comparable generalization could be made about the other groups, since the correlation between the ordering of the characteristics for self-appraisal was .92 between ME and C children, .79 for ME and SS children, and .85 for ME and O.E. children.

[5] The one item with a lower positive perception was "my neighborhood" which 66 per cent said they liked.

# Results

## Section II

## Early Childhood Grades: Prekindergarten through Grade 1

# CHAPTER VIII

# THE MES PROGRAM IN THE EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

Data for the evaluation of the MES program in the early childhood grades are presented separately in this chapter since these grades have many unique elements. Three grades comprised "early childhood" in this study: prekindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade. Second grade was not included in the early childhood evaluation this year because it was determined by last year's study to be as structured in content as the elementary grades, and therefore it did not lend itself to the revised instrument used for the early childhood grades. In selecting the observers, the prime requisite was professional specialization in early childhood education. As noted in the Procedure chapter, the ILOR was adjusted to meet the unstructured form of the early childhood classes. It was divided into two parts, an overall judgment of the class and a separate rating for each activity (rather than lessons, as in the elementary grades) observed within the class. In addition, the GSR was completed based on the visit to the early childhood classes only.

## Activities Observed

Approximately three activities were observed in each class visited in the ME and C/SS schools, but either the type of activity or the number of children involved or both differed substantially. For example, in the ME schools, in prekindergarten about half the activities involved instruction in an academic subject. The rest were evenly distributed among art, play, and miscellaneous activities such as snack time, clean-up, or preparation time. In contrast, in the C/SS schools, prekindergarten activities showed no clustering in any particular subject category.

As for class size, in the ME prekindergartens, 92 per cent of the activities were conducted with groups of 15 or fewer children and none had more than 22 children. In comparison, 74 per cent of C/SS prekindergartens had groups of 15 or fewer children, and 17 per cent of the activities had more than 22 children in a group.[1]

In ME and C/SS kindergartens, activities were similar: about half were academic in nature, with the fewest number of activities labeled "Play." But the distribution of children in ME and C/SS kindergartens varied. In ME most often (36 per cent) the activity involved 1-5 children and all others involved 6 to 22 children. In C/SS schools few of the observed activities had fewer than 10 pupils; 62 per cent of those seen had from 11 to 22 pupils in a unit, and 20 per cent had 23 or more.

In first grade, too, activities were comparable (about four-fifths were academic), but fewer children were in the teaching units in the ME schools. For example, there was no first grade MES class activity with more than 22 children, while 26 per cent of the C/SS first grade activities had 23 or more children grouped together.

---

[1] The reader is reminded that the detailed frequency distribution of activity group size by grade for ME, C, and SS schools appeared in Table 3 of Chapter III.

## Observers' Overall Evaluation

After visiting the early childhood classes, the observers gave their overall judgment of each school separately, responding to their impressions based only on these lower grades. The evaluation was based on aspects of the GSR and ILOR that corresponded to those used for the elementary grades, i.e., the school's climate as seen by the attitudes of the children, teachers, supplementary and administrative staff, the school's physical appearance. In addition, the observers were asked their feelings on sending their own child to the school visited and what they felt the pupil day they saw was worth. They also pinpointed the outstanding effective features and problems evident in each school. Then, in the ME schools only, the observers were asked an overall opinion of the MES program assuming the school visited was typical.

The basic data from the overall evaluation are presented in Table 38. A glance down the first column reveals the extent to which the observers positively appraised the ME activities seen. Except for "atmosphere," at least 60 per cent and as many as 91 per cent of the ratings were "above average." In only two instances were more than 7 per cent "below average." In contrast, for only two characteristics were at least half the ratings in the C/SS schools above average, so it is not surprising that for nine of the ten aspects rated, the distribution of ratings was significantly more positive in the ME schools than in either the C or SS schools. The one exception was the aspect labeled the classroom's "atmosphere in terms of warmth and discipline." In appraising this characteristic, the observers found only a small percentage of the classes in any school above average (ME 16 per cent, C/SS 13 per cent), rating the majority of classes seen as average (ME 70 per cent, C/SS 52 per cent).

The results of the early childhood evaluation were comparable to those obtained in the elementary grades for nine of the ten aspects (see Table 39), with the only statistically significant difference involving the same characteristic, classroom atmosphere in terms of warmth and discipline, rated higher in the elementary grades.

Table 40 presents data on six characteristics evaluated in both 1967 and 1968. There were statistically significant differences for only one aspect. More of the observers (78 per cent compared to 54 per cent) found the classrooms attractive this year, than last. The other comparable aspects remained proportionately high.

As in the elementary evaluation, the observers were asked to single out the most effective feature noted in each classroom visited and then list additional effective features. Unlike the findings in the elementary grades, those features most frequently found in the early childhood grades were the same for both ME and C/SS, although the order differed. The three single most effective features were "the number and quality of the additional staff" (ME 40 per cent, C/SS 21 per cent), "effective teaching" (ME 30 per cent, C/SS 25 per cent), and the "availability and variety of materials" (ME 13 per cent, C/SS 14 per cent). In listing the other effective features, 50 per cent of the C/SS ratings named "None" compared to 13 per cent in the ME schools. Nevertheless, as with the single feature, those most frequently reported were the same. Again the "variety and availability of materials" (MES 32 per cent, C/SS 30 per cent) and "effective teaching" (MES 19 per cent, C/SS 10 per cent) were noted, as was "small classes" (MES 11 per cent, C/SS 10 per cent).

The observers were asked to particularize the problems they detected in the schools visited. They indicated that problems were more frequently apparent in the C/SS schools, citing "None" in 31 per cent of the MES schools compared to 19 per cent in the C/SS schools. The same two problems were noted most frequently in both ME and C/SS, although percentages differed. At times the observers felt they witnessed "poor teaching" (MES 14 per cent, C/SS 38 per cent) and that the areas in which the schools were located were a "deterrent to education because of high pupil turnover" (MES 17 per cent, C/SS 16 per cent). One other problem particularly reported in the C/SS were the "large classes" (16 per cent).[2]

When asked their feelings about the future of the MES program,all the early childhood observers recommended that the MES program be continued. Compared to 17 per cent of the observers in the elementary grades, 28 per cent of the early childhood observers recommended that the program be retained "as is," even though they were less consistently enthusiastic about the worth of a pupil day in prekindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade classes than other observers were about the second through sixth. Those who desired some modification in the program largely presented the same suggestions as were noted in the elementary grades, namely: specialized teacher training to utilize more effectively the small classes available, more creative teaching, and a program to psychologically orient teachers going into "disadvantaged areas."

Table 41 presents the data for the observers' ratings of the value of the school day and their reaction to sending a child of their own to the school they had visited. Considering the second question first, not only were the observers significantly more often "enthusiastic" about sending a child to the ME school, but the distributions for MES and C/SS were almost inverted, so completely opposite were the appraisals. The observers of early childhood grades in 1968 in ME schools were as frequently enthusiastic about having a child of their own attend the school (66 per cent) as the observers of the elementary grades in 1968 (60 per cent) or of the early childhood grades in 1967 (66 per cent) had been.

Although the ME rating was significantly higher, relatively low ratings for both ME and C/SS were made by the early childhood observers for the worth of the pupil day seen. The observers reported only 19 per cent of the ME lessons and none of the C/SS were worth more than the average day;

---

[2] That class size in C/SS schools was both an effective feature and a problem reflects the greater range in size in these schools.

## TABLE 38

## DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR AND GSR FOR OVERALL FUNCTIONING, BY SCHOOL TYPE, IN PER CENT, EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

| | Above | | | | Average | | | | Below | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Characteristic** | MES | C/SS | C | S | MES | C/SS | C | S | MES | C/SS | C | S |
| Attractiveness of building | 65 | 34 | 38 | 29 | 22 | 40 | 31 | 50 | 13 | 26 | 31 | 21 |
| Attractiveness of classroom | 78 | 29 | 38 | 21 | 22 | 67 | 62 | 72 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 |
| General school climate | 91 | 19 | 23 | 14 | 6 | 62 | 46 | 79 | 3 | 19 | 31 | 7 |
| Attitude of teaching staff toward children | 91 | 41 | 31 | 50 | 9 | 48 | 54 | 43 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 7 |
| Attitude of administration staff | 87 | 44 | 42 | 46 | 13 | 36 | 42 | 31 | 0 | 20 | 16 | 23 |
| Attitude of supplementary teaching and service staff | 75 | 46 | 46 | 47 | 19 | 35 | 31 | 38 | 6 | 19 | 23 | 15 |
| Attitude of children toward teaching staff | 85 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 15 | 38 | 33 | 43 | 0 | 12 | 17 | 7 |
| Overall teacher-pupil relationship | 89 | 70 | 69 | 72 | 5 | 19 | 22 | 16 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 12 |
| Classroom's appearance | 60 | 38 | 49 | 29 | 33 | 43 | 36 | 48 | 7 | 19 | 15 | 23 |
| Atmosphere in terms of discipline and warmth | 16 | 13 | 18 | 8 | 70 | 52 | 48 | 57 | 14 | 35 | 34 | 35 |

## TABLE 39

## DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR AND GSR FOR OVERALL FUNCTIONING, BY SCHOOL TYPE, IN PER CENT FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD AND ELEMENTARY GRADES, 1968, MES ONLY

| | Above | | Average | | Below | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristic | Early Childhood | Elementary | Early Childhood | Elementary | Early Childhood | Elementary |
| Attractiveness of building | 65 | 67 | 22 | 20 | 13 | 13 |
| Attractiveness of classroom | 78 | 80 | 22 | 17 | 0 | 3 |
| General school climate | 91 | 80 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 3 |
| Attitude of teaching staff toward children | 91 | 76 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 7 |
| Attitude of administration staff | 87 | 79 | 13 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| Attitude of supplementary teaching and service staff | 75 | 78 | 19 | 22 | 6 | 0 |
| Attitude of children toward teaching staff | 85 | 70 | 15 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Overall teacher pupil relationship | 89 | 75 | 5 | 18 | 6 | 7 |
| Classroom's appearance | 60 | 51 | 33 | 40 | 7 | 9 |
| Atmosphere in terms of discipline and warmth | 16 | 51 | 70 | 41 | 14 | 8 |

## TABLE 40

### DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON GSR FOR OVERALL FUNCTIONING, MES 1967 AND 1968, IN PER CENT, EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

MES Only

| Characteristic | Above | | Average | | Below | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 |
| Attractiveness of classroom | 54 | 78 | 46 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| General school climate | 91 | 91 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 3 |
| Attitude of teaching staff | 91 | 91 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Attitude of administration staff | 82 | 87 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Attitude of supplementary teaching and service staff | 78 | 75 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 6 |
| Attitude of children toward teaching staff | 73 | 85 | 27 | 15 | 0 | 0 |

## TABLE 41

### OBSERVERS' OVERALL EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IN TERMS OF VALUE OF PUPIL DAY AND PLACING OWN CHILD IN SCHOOL, IN PER CENT

| Criterion | 1968 E.C. | | | | 1967 MES E.C. | 1968 MES Elem. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MES | C/SS | C | S | | |
| Own child in school- | | | | | | |
| enthusiastic | 66 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 64 | 60 |
| accepting | 28 | 44 | 36 | 50 | 27 | 30 |
| rejecting | 6 | 48 | 55 | 43 | 9 | 10 |
| Worth of pupil day - | | | | | | |
| above average | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 59 |
| average | 53 | 44 | 33 | 54 | 20 | 27 |
| below average | 28 | 56 | 67 | 46 | 10 | 14 |

the majority of the C/SS were valued as being below average (56 per cent) and the majority of the ME as average (53 per cent). In comparison, 59 per cent of the 1968 elementary grade ratings were "above average," as were 70 per cent of the early childhood ratings in 1967. Thus despite their positive appraisal and enthusiasm, the 1968 observers did not believe they had seen lessons of above average dollar value.

## Teacher Functioning

As was done in the elementary grades, teacher functioning in the early childhood grades was estimated by means of 11 items from the GSR and ILOR. These were observer ratings of the in-class instruction and the teachers' level of verbal communication with the children. The data are presented in Table 42.

For 8 of the 11 instructional aspects there was a statistically significant difference in the distributions. Observers consistently rated the aspect "above average" more often in ME than in C/SS schools. Only for the three items on communication and questioning were the distributions comparable.

For ME early childhood grades, ratings were above average in the "quality of instruction" (68 per cent), the "amount of planning and organization" evident (54 per cent), "handling children's questions" (49 per cent), the "depth of instruction" (48 per cent), the "amount of material covered" in the lesson (47 per cent), the "type of discipline and control exercised" (91 per cent) and "verbal communication" (94 per cent). The highest proportions of above average ratings for the C/SS schools were "handling children's questions" (33 per cent), "quality of instruction" (32 per cent), and the "type of discipline" shown (32 per cent). The use of "teaching aids" was seldom seen as above average in either school type (21 per cent ME, 5 per cent C/SS), but only 39 per cent of the MES lessons were found to be "below average" as compared to 66 per cent in the C/SS schools.

Of the same aspects, in comparing the MES early childhood to the elementary grades (Table 43) there were no overall differences, for statistically significant differences were found in only two instances. In the overall quality of instruction approximately half the elementary lessons were rated above average (52 per cent), compared to two-thirds of those in early childhood grades (68 per cent). Typically, the observers rated the amount of planning and organization they saw in the elementary classes as "average" (63 per cent), but felt that more than half the early childhood activities were "above average" (54 per cent). In both these differences the more positive ratings were given in the early childhood years.

A comparison of the MES 1967 and 1968 early childhood data for seven comparable aspects (Table 44) shows no consistent differences. In only two aspects did they differ significantly: the "amount of planning and organization" evident in the lesson (more positively rated in 1968) and "level of creativity and imagination" (less positively rated in 1968). These data reflect no overall changes in the quality of teacher functioning.

### TABLE 42

### DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR FOR TEACHER FUNCTIONING, BY SCHOOL TYPE, IN PER CENT, EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

| | Above | | | | Average | | | | Below | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristic | ME | C/SS | C | S | ME | C/SS | C | S | ME | C/SS | C | S |
| Overall quality of instruction | 68 | 32 | 36 | 28 | 16 | 35 | 31 | 39 | 16 | 33 | 33 | 33 |
| Amount of planning and organization | 54 | 30 | 33 | 27 | 26 | 39 | 32 | 46 | 20 | 31 | 35 | 27 |
| Level of creativity and imagination | 31 | 11 | 16 | 6 | 29 | 21 | 15 | 27 | 40 | 68 | 69 | 67 |
| Use of children's background and experience | 42 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 64 | 65 | 62 | 34 | 13 | 12 | 15 |
| Use of teaching aids | 21 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 40 | 29 | 36 | 23 | 39 | 66 | 58 | 75 |
| Amount of material covered | 47 | 19 | 23 | 15 | 32 | 51 | 44 | 58 | 21 | 30 | 33 | 27 |
| Depth of instruction | 48 | 22 | 24 | 20 | 31 | 38 | 31 | 47 | 21 | 40 | 45 | 33 |
| Type of discipline and control | 91 | 32 | 25 | 38 | 9 | 56 | 59 | 54 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 8 |
| Handling of children's questions | 49 | 33 | 22 | 43 | 15 | 23 | 30 | 17 | 36 | 44 | 48 | 40 |
| Verbal communication with children | 94 | 90 | 91 | 90 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| Communication with non-English speaking children | 58 | a | 68 | a | 37 | a | 32 | a | 5 | a | 0 | a |

[a] There were too few classes in which this aspect was rated to analyze the data for the Special Service Schools.

## TABLE 43

## COMPARATIVE OBSERVER RATINGS OF ILOR AND GSR ASPECTS OF TEACHER FUNCTIONING, MES 1968, IN PER CENT EARLY CHILDHOOD AND ELEMENTARY GRADES

| | Above | | Average | | Below | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristic | Early Childhood | Elementary | Early Childhood | Elementary | Early Childhood | Elementary |
| Quality of instruction | 68 | 52 | 16 | 38 | 16 | 10 |
| Planning and organization | 54 | 32 | 26 | 63 | 20 | 5 |
| Creativity and imagination | 31 | 24 | 29 | 26 | 40 | 50 |
| Use of children's background and experience | 42 | 32 | 24 | 48 | 34 | 20 |
| Use of teaching aids | 21 | 12 | 40 | 31 | 39 | 57 |
| Material covered | 47 | 39 | 32 | 48 | 21 | 13 |
| Depth of instruction | 48 | 48 | 31 | 36 | 21 | 16 |
| Type of discipline and control | 91 | 80 | 9 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Handling children's questions | 49 | 45 | 15 | 22 | 36 | 33 |
| Verbal communication with children | 94 | 91 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 |

TABLE 44

DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR FOR
TEACHER FUNCTIONING, MES 1967 AND 1968, IN PER CENT,
EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

| | MES ONLY | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Above | | Average | | Below | |
| Characteristic | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 |
| Overall quality of instruction | 54 | 68 | 29 | 16 | 17 | 16 |
| Amount of planning and organization | 29 | 54 | 59 | 26 | 12 | 20 |
| Level of creativity and imagination | 59 | 31 | 22 | 29 | 19 | 40 |
| Use of children's background and experience | 59 | 42 | 34 | 24 | 7 | 34 |
| Use of teaching aids | 32 | 21 | 34 | 40 | 34 | 39 |
| Amount of material covered | 51 | 47 | 29 | 32 | 20 | 21 |
| Depth of instruction | 48 | 48 | 33 | 31 | 19 | 21 |

### Pupil Functioning

The eight aspects of pupil functioning studied for the early childhood evaluation encompassed the children's understanding of the teacher's word, verbal fluency, relationship with their peers, and their interest and response to the activities as expressed on several levels. These were the same criteria used for the elementary grades. The distributions appear in Table 45.

There were statistically significant differences between early childhood ME and C/SS schools in five aspects, with the ME schools obtaining the higher proportion of above average ratings. These five differences involved the "overall verbal fluency" (MES 60 per cent, C/SS 37 per cent), "children's interest and enthusiasm" (MES 81 per cent, C/SS 65 per cent), their voluntary "response" to the teacher's questions (MES 67 per cent, C/SS 49 per cent), the "overall participation of the children" in the activity (MES 91 per cent, C/SS 73 per cent), and the verbal communication among the children (MES 53 per cent, C/SS 34 per cent).

## TABLE 45

## DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR FOR PUPIL FUNCTIONING, BY SCHOOL TYPE, IN PER CENT, EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

| | Above | | | | Average | | | | Below | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Characteristic | MES | C/SS | C | S | MES | C/SS | C | S | MES | C/SS | C | S |
| Children's interest and enthusiasm | 81 | 66 | 65 | 67 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Children volunteered in response to teacher | 67 | 49 | 49 | 48 | 14 | 19 | 14 | 24 | 19 | 32 | 37 | 28 |
| Children raised questions | 11 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 80 | 94 | 98 | 90 |
| Overall participation of children | 91 | 73 | 79 | 68 | 5 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 19 |
| Children's general understanding of teacher's word | 96 | 86 | 91 | 81 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 6 | - | 13 |
| Overall verbal fluency of children who participated | 60 | 37 | 36 | 42 | 33 | 49 | 51 | 43 | 7 | 14 | 13 | 15 |
| Verbal communication among the children | 53 | 34 | 35 | 43 | 39 | 50 | 55 | 50 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 17 |
| Overall relationship among the children | 84 | 72 | 76 | 68 | 15 | 22 | 20 | 24 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 8 |

For both ME and C/SS the observers found the relationship among the children and the children's understanding of the teacher's word to be above average, while the number of children who raised spontaneous questions during a lesson were few.

In comparing the two MES grade groups, elementary and early childhood (see Table 46), five of the eight rated items showed statistically significant differences, with three of the differences more positive in the early childhood grades and two in the elementary grades. Thus while the rating of the number of children who actively participated in the lesson was positive in the elementary grades (76 per cent above average), it was even more so in the early childhood grades (91 per cent). Similar differences were found for the "interest and enthusiasm" the children displayed (54 per cent elementary, 81 per cent early childhood), and for the number of children who "responded voluntarily" to teacher questions (41 per cent elementary, 67 per cent early childhood). The observers' ratings indicated the elementary grades superior to the early childhood in the "overall verbal fluency" of those children who participated in class (75 per cent to 60 per cent) and in the "clarity of articulation and correct grammar" the children used in verbal communications with one another (69 per cent to 53 per cent).

In comparing ME pupil functioning in 1967 and 1968 (see Table 47), two aspects showed a statistically significant difference. In both, the more positive ratings were reported this year, involving the children's interest and enthusiasm (81 per cent above average in 1968 compared to 60 per cent in 1967) and "verbal fluency" (60 per cent above average in 1968, 33 per cent in 1967).

## Summary

The data on the evaluation of the early childhood years reflect a more positive appraisal of the ME program than of the C or SS programs in these years. For example, there was a generally positive appraisal of overall school functioning in all three types of schools, yet the appraisal was significantly more often positive in the ME schools. Similarly, in the ratings for teacher functioning, in the typical ME lesson, the aspects were rated "above average" compared to "average" in the comparison schools. In the ratings for pupil functioning the differences were less consistent, but all of the significant differences did indicate superior functioning in the ME schools. Generally there were no consistent differences for the ME schools between the pattern of ratings in the early childhood years and in the elementary years, nor between 1967 and 1968 for the early childhood years only.

TABLE 46

COMPARATIVE OBSERVER RATINGS OF ILOR AND GSR
ASPECTS OF PUPIL FUNCTIONING, MES 1968
EARLY CHILDHOOD AND ELEMENTARY GRADES

| Characteristic | Above |  | Average |  | Below |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Early Childhood | Elementary | Early Childhood | Elementary | Early Childhood | Elementary |
| Children's interest and enthusiasm | 81 | 54 | 12 | 17 | 7 | 29 |
| Children volunteered in response to teacher | 67 | 41 | 14 | 24 | 19 | 35 |
| Children raised questions | 11 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 80 | 90 |
| Overall participation of children | 91 | 76 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 16 |
| Children's general understanding of teacher's word | 96 | 88 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| Overall verbal fluency of children who participated | 60 | 75 | 33 | 25 | 7 | 0 |
| Verbal communication among the children | 53 | 69 | 39 | 31 | 8 | 0 |
| Overall relationship among the children | 84 | 88 | 15 | 10 | 1 | 2 |

### TABLE 47

### DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS OBTAINED ON ILOR FOR PUPIL FUNCTIONING, MES 1967 AND 1968 IN PER CENT, EARLY CHILDHOOD GRADES

| | MES Only | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Above | | Average | | Below | |
| Characteristic | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 |
| Children's interest and enthusiasm | 60 | 81 | 28 | 12 | 12 | 7 |
| Children volunteered in response to teacher's questions | 58 | 67 | 15 | 14 | 27 | 19 |
| Children raised questions | 6 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 82 | 80 |
| Overall participation of children | 88 | 91 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 4 |
| Overall verbal fluency of children who participated | 33 | 60 | 40 | 9 | 27 | 31 |

# CHAPTER IX

# IN-CLASS ACTIVITIES IN THIRD AND FIFTH GRADES

One phase of the 1967-68 evaluation was an effort to obtain data through which to describe the nature of the in-class activities in a sample of third and fifth grade classes. The rationale for the study was the concern noted by two different evaluation teams (covering the school years 1965-66 and 1966-67) that they saw little evidence of difference in the instructional process in the ME schools as compared to schools with regular programs. As a first step in providing data relevant to this question, this year's evaluation team decided to obtain descriptive data as to what happened in a sample of ME, C, and SS classrooms by the full day observations described in Chapter II. The data obtained and presented in this chapter were intended to be purely descriptive. No evaluative ratings were made directly by the observers nor were any inferred by the evaluation team. The study was specifically intended to answer the following questions:

1. In what content areas does instruction take place, and how much time is allocated to each area?
2. For how much of the school day does the class receive instruction as a total class, and therefore for how much of the day do they receive instruction in groups?
3. How often is instruction provided at different levels?
4. How often is instruction departmentalized?
5. How often do pupils receive instruction out of class?
6. How often is the class interrupted by some kind of internal or external interference; and what is the nature of the interruptions?
7. Who is responsible for instruction, and for what proportion of the day is each person responsible?

## The Content Areas of Instruction

Table 48 presents the proportion of classes receiving instruction in each of the six content areas selected for analysis. With the exception of the 69 per cent of SS fifth grade classes in which instruction in reading was provided, at least 85 per cent and as many as 100 per cent of the classes received instruction at some point during the day in Reading, Language Arts, and Arithmetic. This was equally true of the third and fifth grades. Next came Arts and Crafts and Social Studies, which presented an interlocking, opposite set of data, seen more often in one grade than the other. As would be expected, Arts and Crafts instruction was more frequently seen in the third grade classes, and

Social Studies instruction in the fifth grade classes. Finally, instruction in science was seen in fewer than half the classes, with the range dipping down to the 23 per cent of the SS third grade classes in which a science lesson was seen. Contrary to expectation, there were no significant differences in the frequency of science lessons in the two grades studied.

TABLE 48

PER CENT OF CLASSES RECEIVING INSTRUCTION IN VARIOUS ACADEMIC SUBJECTS, BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

| | 3rd Grade | | | 5th Grade | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Subject | ME | C | SS | ME | C | SS |
| Reading | 96 | 100 | 85 | 100 | 92 | 69 |
| Language Arts | 96 | 100 | 92 | 92 | 100 | 85 |
| Arithmetic | 96 | 92 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 100 |
| Arts & Crafts | 85 | 77 | 31 | 62 | 67 | 31 |
| Social Studies | 54 | 62 | 69 | 92 | 92 | 85 |
| Science | 46 | 31 | 23 | 42 | 42 | 31 |

A more precise insight into the nature of instruction in these content areas is provided in Tables 49, 50, and 51, which present the number of minutes of instruction provided in these six areas.

These tables indicate the number of classes that did and did not provide instruction in the content area. Also presented are two medians, one the overall median amount of instruction including the classes with no (zero minutes) instruction and a second median considering only those classes which provided instruction in the area. Thus, the reader can see the two relevant aspects of these data: first, how much instruction was provided on the average in the classes, and second, when a lesson was given in the area, how long that lesson was.

The data in Table 49 for reading and language arts indicate that, in the third grade, the MES classes devoted more time to reading, but less to language arts than the C or SS classes. The result of these differences is that on the average, the total amount of instructional time devoted to these two aspects was comparable: 108 minutes for the MES classes, and 112 for the C/SS classes (specifically 123 or 124 for C and 103 for the SS classes).

## TABLE 49

## AMOUNT OF INSTRUCTION GIVEN IN READING AND LANGUAGE ARTS BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL, PER CENT OF CLASSES

| Amount of Time in Minutes | Third Grade | | | | | | | | Fifth Grade | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Reading | | | | Language Arts | | | | Reading | | | | Language Arts | | | |
| | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C | SS |
| 121+ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 111-120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 101-110 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 9 |
| 91-100 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 81-90 | 12 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 |
| 71-80 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 17 | 9 |
| 61-70 | 12 | 17 | 23 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 17 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| 51-60 | 16 | 21 | 15 | 28 | 12 | 16 | 8 | 26 | 8 | 30 | 28 | 34 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 9 |
| 41-50 | 12 | 21 | 31 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 30 | 15 | 18 | 11 | 26 | 18 | 17 | 18 |
| 31-40 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 36 | 20 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 15 | 18 | 11 | 21 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| 21-30 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 34 | 9 |
| 11-20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 8 | 19 |
| 1-10 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 9 |
| Median Amt.of Time | 65.5 | 52.5 | 58.0 | 45.5 | 43.0 | 59.3 | 65.5 | 57.2 | 45.5 | 52.2 | 55.5 | 45.5 | 47.2 | 41.8 | 40.5 | 43.0 |
| Total No. Classes Rec. Instruction | 25 | 24 | 13 | 11 | 25 | 25 | 13 | 12 | 26 | 20 | 11 | 9 | 24 | 23 | 12 | 11 |
| No.Not Rec. Instruction | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Overall Median | 61.3 | 50.5 | 58.0 | 39.3 | 40.5 | 58.0 | 65.5 | 55.5 | 45.5 | 45.5 | 53.8 | 28.0 | 45.5 | 38.0 | 40.5 | 35.5 |

### TABLE 50

### AMOUNT OF INSTRUCTION GIVEN IN ARITHMETIC AND SCIENCE BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL, PER CENT OF CLASSES

| Amount of Time in Minutes | Third Grade | | | | | | | | Fifth Grade | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Arithmetic | | | | Science | | | | Arithmetic | | | | Science | | | |
| | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C[a] | SS[a] | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C[a] | SS[a] |
| 101-110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 91-100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 81-90 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 14 | (1) | | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 71-80 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | | (1) |
| 61-70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 11 | (1) | |
| 51-60 | 12 | 12 | 17 | 8 | 8 | 14 | (1) | | 20 | 20 | 25 | 15 | 9 | 0 | | |
| 41-50 | 28 | 24 | 8 | 38 | 17 | 14 | (1) | | 48 | 32 | 42 | 23 | 9 | 0 | | |
| 31-40 | 40 | 28 | 33 | 23 | 42 | 14 | | (1) | 8 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 46 | 45 | (2) | (2) |
| 21-30 | 8 | 16 | 17 | 15 | 17 | 30 | | (1) | 12 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 18 | 22 | (2) | |
| 11-20 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 14 | | (1) | 0 | 12 | 17 | 8 | 18 | 11 | | |
| 1-10 | 4 | 8 | 17 | 0 | 8 | 0 | (1) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | (1) |
| Median | 38.0 | 38.4 | 35.5 | 41.5 | 34.5 | 35.5 | a | a | 46.8 | 44.9 | 60.5 | 42.2 | 33.5 | 34.3 | | |
| Total No. Classes Rec. Instruction | 25 | 25 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 25 | 25 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 4 |
| Total No. Not Rec. Instruction | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 7 | 9 |
| Overall Median | 37.5 | 37.6 | 34.3 | 41.5 | b | b | b | b | 46.3 | 44.9 | 60.5 | 42.2 | b | b | b | b |

[a] The number of lessons in the C and SS schools separately was too few for medians or per cents to be meaningful. Instead, the number of classes in each interval is indicated.

[b] Since more than half the classes did not receive instruction in this content area, the overall median is not meaningful.

# TABLE 51

## AMOUNT OF INSTRUCTION GIVEN IN SOCIAL STUDIES AND ARTS AND CRAFTS BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL, PER CENT OF CLASSES

| Amount of Time in Minutes | Third Grade | | | | | | | | Fifth Grade | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Social Studies | | | | Arts and Crafts | | | | Social Studies | | | | Arts and Crafts | | | |
| | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C | SS |
| 101+ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 91-100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 11 |
| 81-90 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 71-80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 22 |
| 61-70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 28 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 11 |
| 51-60 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 34 | 9 | 16 | 10 | 22 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 41-50 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 10 | 45 | 33 | 14 | 18 | 9 | 23 | 18 | 39 | 0 |
| 31-40 | 36 | 28 | 38 | 22 | 29 | 26 | 30 | 22 | 33 | 23 | 37 | 9 | 18 | 23 | 25 | 22 |
| 21-30 | 14 | 18 | 12 | 22 | 14 | 21 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 14 | 18 | 9 | 18 | 23 | 12 | 34 |
| 11-20 | 7 | 18 | 25 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1-10 | 0 | 18 | 25 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 0 |
| Median | 38.5 | 28.8 | 20.5 | 33.0 | 37.2 | 37.5 | 30.5 | 44.3 | 40.5 | 36.5 | 31.8 | 55.5 | 44.3 | 39.3 | 40.5 | 38.0 |
| Total No. Classes Rec. Instruction | 14 | 17 | 8 | 9 | 22 | 19 | 10 | 9 | 24 | 22 | 11 | 11 | 17 | 17 | 8 | 0 |
| No. Classes Not Rec. Instruction | 12 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| Overall Median | 20.5 | 13.8 | 8.0 | 23.0 | 33.8 | 30.5 | 25.5 | 38.0 | 39.3 | 33.5 | 30.5 | 45.5 | 30.5 | 29.3 | 30.5 | 29.0 |

At the fifth grade, the medians were close for both content areas, with the only suggestions of differences in the observed data that the C classes spent more time on reading than either the MES or SS classes, with the MES classes spending more time on language arts than either comparison group. Again the totals across the two areas were comparable: 93 minutes for MES, 96 for C, and 88 or 89 for SS classes.

The variation in instructional time within school type is also made clear by the data in Table 49. For example, in the MES third grade classes observed, one class spent no time during the day on reading instruction, while the instruction which was given in 25 classes ranged from 100 minutes to 5 minutes.

Recognizing the limitations of sampling involved, for the MES classes we correlated the number of minutes of instruction given in reading during the day of the observation with the median reading grade of the class on the citywide Metropolitan Achievement Tests in April. Neither the correlation at the third nor at the fifth grade was statistically significantly different from zero, indicating no relationship between length of daily instruction in reading and average reading ability.

Table 50 presents the distributions of instructional time for arithmetic and science. The science distributions are limited by the few (3 to 5) lessons in which science was taught in the C and SS schools; however, science lessons were more frequently seen in the MES classes at the third grade.

In those classes in which instruction was given, the amount of time devoted to arithmetic was comparable among the types of schools at the third grade, but the C schools devoted more time to this area at the fifth grade than either the ME or SS schools. The amount of time devoted to science instruction was comparable at each grade.

Table 51 presents the instructional time devoted to Social Studies and Arts and Crafts. At both grades the frequency of lessons in Social Studies was comparable, with the ME and SS classes devoting more time to this area than the C classes. There were particularly large differences between ME and C classes at the third grade (38.5 minutes compared to 20.5 minutes) and between SS and C classes at the fifth grade (55.5 minutes compared to 31.8 minutes).

In Arts and Crafts, the frequency of instruction was comparable as was the amount of time devoted to this area across the types of schools.

## Summary

This analysis of the instructional time devoted to the different content areas indicates more comparability than difference in the three types of schools, particularly at the fifth grade. The MES third grade classes spent more time on reading than the C and SS classes, which in turn spent more time on language arts.[1]

---

[1] Since all three types of schools worked within the same length of school day every difference in one direction had to be compensated by a difference in some other area. Thus, the reader should note that no one piece of data reported in this section is fully independent of any other.

The ME classes were more likely to have a science lesson, but for those classes that had them, there were no differences between school types in the time devoted to science. Thus, we conclude that the school day was allocated to the content areas in much the same way in all three types of schools.

## Time Spent as a Total Class

In Table 52,data are presented on the total amount of time the classes observed spent as a total class. Here there are consistent differences indicated at both third and fifth grade: the MES classes spent less time together as a total class, and thus more time broken up into groups for instructional purposes. The difference was about an hour at the third grade and 40 minutes at the fifth. Moreover, this difference reflected in the medians is perhaps even more strongly expressed if one considers the proportion of classes that spent more than 260 minutes together as a total class. At the third grade this proportion was 12 per cent for MES classes but 70 per cent and 53 per cent for the C and SS classes. At the fifth grade the same proportions were 30 per cent compared to 59 per cent and 69 per cent.

At the opposite end of the distribution, considering the proportion of classes in which total class instruction was 200 minutes or less, the data in Table 52 indicate that,while this happened in 46 per cent of the MES third grade classes, it never happened in a third grade C class and in only 8 per cent of the SS classes. Similarly, at the fifth grade, 35 per cent of the MES classes, but only 16 per cent of the C and none of the SS classes met as a total class for less than 200 minutes.

These data indicate that in 1967-68 the ME schools took action that counters the criticism voiced in previous evaluations that,typically, total class instruction characterized the schools.

## Time Devoted to Different Levels of Instruction

Table 53 presents the mean number of minutes of instruction in reading and in arithmetic provided at two or more levels of instruction. At both grades and in both content areas the data indicate the same differences: instruction at two or more levels more often characterized the MES classes than either the C or SS classes. But within subject,for the third grade, this difference was arrived at differently. In Reading, at the third grade there was little difference in the amount of time devoted to two levels of instruction. In ME classes, four times as much time was devoted to three or four levels of instruction as in the comparison classes. In contrast, in Arithmetic at the third grade there were differences in the amount of time devoted to two levels of instruction, with more than two levels observed in only one ME class.

Thus, the finding presented in the data of Table 52 that more time was devoted to instruction in groups rather than in whole classes in ME schools is further developed by the finding presented in Table 53, that the instruction was also more often at different levels of instruction.

## TABLE 52

### TOTAL TIME SPENT AS WHOLE CLASS, BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL, IN PER CENT OF CLASSES

| Time in Minutes | Third Grade | | | | Fifth Grade | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MES | C/SS | C | SS | MES | C/SS | C | SS |
| 281-300 | 8 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 12 | 40 | 42 | 38 |
| 261-280 | 4 | 31 | 39 | 23 | 18 | 24 | 17 | 31 |
| 241-260 | 23 | 19 | 15 | 23 | 12 | 12 | 17 | 8 |
| 221-240 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 8 | 15 | 4 | 8 | 0 |
| 201-220 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 23 |
| 181-200 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 161-180 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 8 | 0 |
| 141-160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0 |
| 121-140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 101-120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 81-100 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Median Amount of Time | 207 | 268 | 270 | 264 | 230 | 272 | 270 | 273 |
| Total No. of Classes | 26 | 26 | 13 | 13 | 26 | 25 | 12 | 13 |

## TABLE 53

### MEAN NUMBER OF MINUTES OF READING AND ARITHMETIC INSTRUCTION AT TWO, THREE, AND FOUR LEVELS OF INSTRUCTION

| | Reading | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. of Levels of Instruction | Third Grade | | | | Fifth Grade | | | |
| | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C | SS |
| 2 | 15.5 | 16.5 | 20.3 | 12.7 | 13.9 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 3.8 |
| 3 | 12.5 | 3.1 | 1.1 | 5.0 | 7.3 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 0 |
| 4 | 4.9 | 1.0 | 0 | 2.1 | 5.4 | 2.1 | 3.9 | .4 |
| Total | 32.9 | 20.6 | 21.4 | 19.8 | 26.6 | 5.8 | 7.4 | 4.2 |
| | Arithmetic | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 11.7 | .7 | .4 | .9 | 9.5 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 8.0 |
| 3 | .2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 3.6 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.7 | 0 | 3.5 |
| Total | 11.9 | .7 | .4 | .9 | 13.1 | 9.4 | 7.4 | 11.5 |

## Frequency of Departmentalized Instruction

Table 54 presents the data on the frequency with which departmentalized instruction was seen in the classes observed, again for reading and arithmetic. To fully interpret this table one must consider the footnotes which indicate that the number of schools providing departmentalized instruction was many fewer than the number of lessens in which it was seen. The point indicated by this is that about two-thirds of the ME schools provided some departmentalized instruction in reading at the third and fifth grades but only one fifth did in arithmetic. At third and fifth grades,in either content area,only an isolated Control or Special Service school provided such instruction.

Since the ME schools are staffed with specialists and cluster teachers and thus are more able to establish departmentalized instruction than the typical school, the comparative finding of difference is to be expected. More important is the descriptive information provided by the data in Table 54 that departmentalized instruction is provided in most ME schools in reading but is relatively infrequent in arithmetic. When it was provided, however, about the same median amount of time was devoted to instruction in each content area, at each grade studied.

Once again the data also indicate the wide variation in time devoted to specific lessons, with the range in Table 54 going from 16 minutes to more than one hour.

## Frequency of Extra-Classroom Instruction

Table 55 presents the data through which one can understand the frequency with which children were taken from a class for instruction. In some instances this was for small group instruction (as in a remedial reading group); in other instances it was for individual instruction (as in an individual remedial speech lesson). Individual and group instruction are not differentiated in the table since the observers reported that they were not always able to determine this aspect of the extra-class instruction.

Extra-class instruction was seen in the same four areas at both the third and fifth grade, and as is obvious from the table, was not frequent at either grade in any area. At most 23 per cent of the classes[2] were involved in any one area and usually no more than 1 or 2 per cent were. Moreover, the number of children involved was small, never exceeding 21 for any one type of school. This is 21 out of about 500 for the ME schools and 350 to 400 for the C and SS schools.

Within this generalization of infrequent occurrence, the practice of taking children from the class for instruction did occur more consistently in the ME schools. At least one of these schools is represented in each

---

[2] This most frequent occurrence involves the 6 (of 26) MES third grade classes from which children were taken for instruction in reading.

TABLE 54

DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNT OF TIME IN DEPARTMENTALIZED READING AND ARITHMETIC INSTRUCTION

| Amount of Time in Minutes | Number of Classes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Reading Instruction | | | | | | | | Arithmetic Instruction | | | | | | | |
| | Third | | | | Fifth | | | | Third | | | | Fifth | | | |
| | MES | C/SS | C | SS | MES | C/SS | C | SS | MES | C/SS | C | SS | MES | C/SS | C | SS |
| 61+ | 4 | | | | 3 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| 56-60 | 3 | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51-55 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| 46-50 | 1 | 1 | | | 4 | | | | | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| 41-45 | 1 | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | 2 | | | |
| 36-40 | 7 | | | | 3 | | | | 3 | | | | 1 | | | |
| 31-35 | 0 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| 26-30 | 0 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | |
| 21-25 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| 16-20 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Classroom With None | 9 | 24 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 25 | 12 | 13 | 22 | 23 | 12 | 11 | 21 | 25 | 12 | 13 |
| Total No. of Lessons | $20^a$ | $2^b$ | 0 | $2^b$ | $22^c$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $4^d$ | $3^e$ | 1 | $2^b$ | $6^f$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Median | 39.8 | | | | 48.0 | | | | 38.8 | | | | 40.5 | | | |

a=Represents 9 ME schools and 17 classes
b=Represents 1 SS school and 2 classes
c=Represents 12 ME schools and 20 classes
d=Represents 3 ME schools and 4 classes
e=Represents 1 SS school (2 lessons) and 1 C school.
f=Represents 3 ME schools and 5 classes

## TABLE 55

## INSTANCES OF EXTRA-CLASS INSTRUCTIONAL TIME (MINUTES) BY GRADE, TYPE OF INSTRUCTION, AND SCHOOL, NUMBER OF CHILDREN, NUMBER OF CLASSES

| Type of Instruction and School | 3rd Grade Minutes 1-15 | 16-25 | 26-35 | 36-45 | 46-55 | 56+ | Total No. of Times | No. of Classes Invol. | No. of Child. Invol. | 5th Grade Minutes 1-15 | 16-25 | 26-35 | 36-45 | 46-55 | 56+ | Total No. of Times | No. of Clas. | No. of Child. Invol. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Reading** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ME | | 1 | 2 | | 4 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 19 | | | | | 4 | | 4 | 4 | 21 |
| C/SS | | | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 32 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| C | | | | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 20 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| SS | | | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 2 | 12 | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Non-English Instruction**[a] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ME | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 10 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| C | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 2 | 11 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| **Speech & Phonics**[b] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ME | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 4 | 6 | | | | | | | 1[d] | 1 | 3 |
| SS | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 12 |
| **Arithmetic**[c] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ME | 1 | | | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | 8 | | | 1 | | | | 2[e] | 2 | 4 |

a-No non-English instruction was observed in SS schools.
b-No speech instruction was observed in C schools
c-No arithmetic instruction was observed in C & SS schools.
d-Unable to ascertain amount of instructional time.
e-Unable to ascertain amount of instructional time for one occurrence.

content area at both grades, whereas the C schools appear only for reading and non-English instruction and the SS for reading and speech, with neither represented in arithmetic.

Overall, we conclude that the practice is too infrequent and involves too few children to be considered a significant component of the instructional process in the schools and grades studied.

Frequency and Nature of Internal and External Interruptions[3]

Table 56 presents data concerning the frequency of interruptions and the amount of time elapsing between each interference. The median amount of time between interruptions ranged in the third grade sample from approximately 3 minutes for SS schools to 4 minutes for ME classes and 5 minutes for C schools. Slightly more time elapsed between interruptions in the fifth grade classes, where a span of approximately 5 minutes occurred for MES, C, and SS schools.

The results of a content analysis concerning the nature of entrances and/or departures to and from the classroom of both children and staff are reported in Table 57. The most frequent source of interruptions in all schools was the entering and leaving of children on errands, which accounted for almost half the total number of interruptions. Approximately one-quarter of the interruptions were attributed to teachers and other instructional and non-instructional staff. Late children, children removed for discipline, or extra-curricular activities, and children leaving for miscellaneous or unknown reasons comprised the remaining causes of classroom interruptions. Differences between ME and C/SS combined, at both grade levels, for each of the categories were negligible.

Teachers Present in Classroom

The median amount of time different teachers spent in the classroom and the number of classes in which they were present based on a 300 minute school day is reported in Table 58. The regular teacher in ME schools spent approximately three quarters of an hour less time in both third and fifth grade classes than the regular teacher in C and SS classes combined. In one ME class at both the third and fifth grade level, the regular teacher was never in the room without the presence of another staff member.

Considering next those instances in which either the cluster teacher or the specialist was alone with the class in the third grade, each of these kinds of teachers was seen more often in the ME classes compared to the C/SS classes, but this was true only for the cluster teacher at the fifth grade. Interestingly enough, at the third grade the amount of time these teachers actually spent in class was comparable in all three types of schools for both roles: about 40 minutes for the cluster teacher and 47 minutes for the specialists. This was not true at the fifth grade where the cluster teachers were present longer (50 minutes) in the SS schools than in either the ME (45 minutes) or C (44 minutes), and the specialists present longer in ME (51 minutes) than C (38 minutes) or SS (33 minutes) schools.

---

[3] As noted in Chapter II, an interruption was defined as any departure from, or entry into the room with the exception of bathroom visits and drinks of water.

The data in Table 58 also indicate that only in the ME schools did we see instances in which the regular teacher was in the classroom teaching together with a cluster teacher or a cluster teacher and specialist were teaching together.

The differences in the comparative frequency with which the cluster teacher and specialist were seen in the ME, C, and SS schools is not in and of itself surprising since these positions existed more often in the ME schools. What is important is the finding that not only did the position exist, but that the person filling the position _was_ being used for instructional purposes. In this sense, then, the data indicate that this component of the MES program was being implemented.

## TABLE 56

## MEDIAN NUMBER, AND MEDIAN AMOUNT OF TIME BETWEEN INTERRUPTIONS

| | Third Grade | | | | Fifth Grade | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Statistic** | **MES** | **C/ SS** | **CS** | **SS** | **MES** | **C/ SS** | **CS** | **SS** |
| **Number of observation days** | 26 | 26 | 13 | 13 | 26 | 25 | 12 | 13 |
| **Median amount of interruptions per day** | 14.5 | 16.2 | 14.9 | 25.0 | 15.33 | 16.6 | 19.5 | 13.7 |
| **Median amount of time between interruptions** | 4.03 | 3.78 | 4.83 | 3.29 | 4.88 | 4.99 | 4.83 | 5.18 |

## TABLE 57

## PER CENT OF TYPE OF INTERRUPTION, BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

| | Third Grade | | | | Fifth Grade | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type of Interruption | ME | C/SS | C | SS | ME | C/SS | C | SS |
| Child enters or leaves on errand | 46 | 47 | 52 | 44 | 40 | 45 | 47 | 43 |
| Late children | 9 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| Child leaves and/or returns for discipline | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3 |
| Child leaves for extra-curricular activities | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 11 |
| Child leaves for unknown reasons | 6 | 12 | 2 | 18 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| Child leaves for miscellaneous reasons | 7 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| Staff interruptions: | | | | | | | | |
| a) Teachers | 14 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 12 |
| b) Principal and/or Ass't. Principal | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| c) Other instructors and non-instructional staff | 11 | 12 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 12 |
| Total N | 218 | 287 | 106 | 181 | 297 | 311 | 165 | 146 |

## TABLE 58

## NUMBER OF CLASSES AND MEDIAN AMOUNT OF TIME IN MINUTES TEACHER(S) PRESENT IN CLASSROOM, BY GRADE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

| Type of Teacher(s) | ME | | C/SS | | C | | SS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. of Classes | Med.Amt. of Time | No. of Classes | Med.Amt. of Time | No. of Classes | Med.Amt. of Time | No. of Classes | Med.Amt of Time |
| | | | | Third Grade | | | | |
| Regular | 25 | 201.9 | 26 | 246.2 | 13 | 245.5 | 13 | 246.5 |
| Cluster | 15 | 39.1 | 6 | 40.5 | 2 | 40.5 | 4 | 40.5 |
| Specialist | 15 | 46.8 | 11 | 46.8 | 4 | 47.2 | 7 | 46.5 |
| Regular & Cluster | 14 | 48.0 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- |
| Regular & Specialist | 6 | 45.5 | 6 | 30.5 | 4 | 30.5 | 2 | 20.5 |
| Cluster & Specialist | 2 | 50.5 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- |
| | | | | Fifth Grade | | | | |
| Regular | 25 | 198.0 | 25 | 242.5 | 12 | 247.2 | 13 | 237.2 |
| Cluster | 17 | 44.8 | 7 | 43.8 | 4 | 50.5 | 3 | 30.5 |
| Specialist | 9 | 50.5 | 9 | 38.5 | 5 | 33.0 | 4 | 47.2 |
| Regular & Cluster | 6 | 33.8 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- |
| Regular & Specialist | 11 | 30.5 | 7 | 43.0 | 3 | 30.5 | 4 | 47.2 |
| Cluster & Specialist | 3 | 35.5 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | -- |

# CHAPTER X

## PARENT OPINION OF THE MES PROGRAM AND TEACHER PERCEPTION OF ROLES AND DECISION-MAKING

Two facets of the 1967-68 evaluation of the MES program did not work out successfully: the effort to estimate parental opinion of the quality of education provided their children in ME, C, and SS schools, and the effort to obtain an insight into teachers' perceptions of the specialist's role as well as of the decision-making process in ME, C, and SS schools. In both instances the instruments distributed were returned in extremely small numbers, and the data therefore provide only a first look into the areas studied but no basis for drawing conclusions. Moreover, the sparse returns which did come in from teachers were predominantly from the ME schools, so the intended comparisons of ME, C, and SS schools have been eliminated.

The survey of parental opinion was conducted by sending a letter home to parents inviting them to come to the school to speak to a member of the evaluation team, herself a parent of a child in a school of the same type (ME or C/SS), but not the identical school. This survey was planned for the end of the school year. However, this proved to be an error, for there was insufficient time to alert and invite the parents to school for the interviews. Clerical confusion by the evaluation team in some schools also reduced the number of returns. For these reasons we do not believe that the small number of returns is in any sense a reflection of the extent of parental interest (or disinterest) either in the MES program specifically or in education in general.

The survey of teachers' perceptions of roles and decision-making was also delayed until the end of the year because of the desire to have the responses based on as much of the school year as possible. In retrospect, we attribute the low rate of returns partially to this factor, as well as to the fact that the instruments involved looked imposing and as if they demanded a great deal of time, and to the possibility that many teachers continued to feel that the team conducting this 1967-68 evaluation had not been fully fair to the MES program in the 1966-67 evaluation.[1]

Given these limitations, in this chapter we shall first present the data obtained from parents, then the data obtained from teachers on the decision-making process, and finally the data on role perceptions.

---

[1] In this context, the evaluation team is grateful to the MES Committee of the United Federation of Teachers for suggesting to its teacher members in the ME schools that they participate in this phase of the study.

## Parental Opinion

The full Parent Questionnaire (see Appendix B) consisted of two parts: Part I primarily asked parents to compare their children's school with certain standards; Part II tried to ascertain whether parents wished to become involved in influencing certain decisions which affect the schools and sought parental reactions to specific school situations possibly affecting them or their children. Sufficient data were returned for Part I only, and consequently this section of the report is limited to this portion of the questionnaire.

Table 59 presents the data provided by 89 parents of children attending an ME school and 34 parents of children attending a comparison school on the four ratings made. On all four, the distributions for MES parents were significantly more positive.

In response to the question "How do you think your child's school compares to other elementary schools in the neighborhood?" 84 per cent of the MES parents and 74 per cent of the C/SS parents rated their child's school as equal to or better than others in the neighborhood. However, most of the MES parents' ratings (63 per cent) indicated that the child's school was "a lot better," compared to only 26 per cent of the C/SS parents who gave this rating, a significant difference.

A slightly different picture appeared when parents were asked to extend the base of their comparison to include schools throughout the city in general, to consider the ME school in particular, and parental expectations for an elementary school. In all three comparisons significantly more MES than C/SS parents chose the extremely positive option. A significantly greater per cent believed their children's schools were equal to, or better than, others in the city (71 per cent to 56 per cent), other ME schools (62 per cent to 39 per cent) and what they expected (78 per cent to 57 per cent). MES parents generally felt their children's schools were among the best the city had to offer (50 per cent), a little or a lot better than other ME schools (46 per cent), and a lot better than they expected (55 per cent). No more than 4 per cent of MES parents considered their child's school worse than other schools, but as many as 27 per cent of the C/SS parents did.

Asked if there were something "special" about the school their child attended, the majority in both groups answered affirmatively, although significantly more of the MES parents (83 per cent) than of the C/SS parents (53 per cent) said "yes". Mentioned most often by MES parents were the abundance of staff specialists (by 17 parents), smaller classes (7), and variety of extra-curricular offerings (7). C/SS parents mentioned I.G.C. classes (3) and teachers' attitudes (3).

On the question of the future of MES all but one of the respondents felt the program should be continued. The one exception was a parent of a child who attended an ME school. However, there was disagreement as to the nature of this continuance. Of the MES parents, 26 per cent (23) said the program should be continued "as is," 11 per cent (10) felt "a few changes" were in order, 29 per cent (25) recommended "some" change, and 20 per cent (18) said "a lot of change" was called for and 14 per cent had no opinion. The specific recommendations were: increased student learning (3), more teacher-specialists (3), improvements of teachers' attitudes (3), and two each who wanted more parental involvement in school affairs, additional supplies and equipment, complete implementation of the MES concept in every school, and the expansion of the MES program to other elementary and to secondary schools.

The parents who participated in this study seem pleased by what they know of the MES program. They feel the program, though imperfect, is achieving the objectives which brought it into being. They apparently feel the program should continue striving "to see that no child is deprived of the opportunity to learn the basic skills needed for future citizenship."

TABLE 59

DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS ON PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE,
IN PER CENT

N=89 MES; 34 C/SS

| Comparison of Child's School to: | Child's School | Per Cent of Parents Rating Their Child's School As | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A Lot Better | A Little Better | About the Same | A Little Worse | A Lot Worse | Don't Know | Omit |
| Other Elem. Schools in Neighborhood | ME | 63 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 3 |
| | C/SS | 26 | 24 | 24 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 2 |
| Other Elem. Schools in City | ME | 50 | 13 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 21 | 4 |
| | C/SS | 18 | 9 | 29 | 21 | 3 | 18 | 2 |
| Other ME Schools | ME | 34 | 12 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 9 |
| | C/SS | 6 | 15 | 18 | 12 | 15 | 32 | 2 |
| Parent Expectations for an Elem. School | ME | 55 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 4 |
| | C/SS | 12 | 21 | 24 | 31 | 6 | 6 | 0 |

## Teacher Perception of Decision-Making

Since one component of the MES concept is participative decision-making, this evaluation sought to study this aspect of the program. The focus of the investigation was on two basic facets of the decision-making process, namely, participation and the actual act of decision making.

Two forms of Decision-Making Questionnaire were developed. Each one listed nine decisions[2] and asked the respondent to indicate who, among a list of all possible participants, "should" participate, "does" participate, and then who "should" and "does" make the decision. The decisions comprising the questionnaire were chosen because of interest shown in them as issues by the participants in previous evaluations of the MES program.

Because of the low rate of questionnaire returns the planned comparisons of relative participation of different role groups, of ME and non-ME schools, and of schools within the MES program had to be abandoned. Since only two role groups, teachers and administrators, were mentioned sufficiently, the data presented and the section that follows is based on those decisions in which both teachers and administrators were identified by 20 or more teacher respondents as persons who should participate in the decision-making process. The data are presented in Table 60 for Forms I and II.

The last row of Table 60 indicates that on both Forms, comparable percentages of respondents believed both teachers and administrators should participate (33 per cent to 38 per cent). However, the actual participation of administrators was perceived significantly more often than that of teachers and greater than it should have been. The overall actual participation of administrators, while consistent with tradition, was not consistent with the respondents' collective perception of how things should be.

The specific decisions in which the respondents reported administrative participation more often than they wanted it involved decisions dealing with teacher orientation, lesson plan evaluations, non-teaching assignments of teacher-specialists, curriculum evaluation, curriculum revision, and school organization. In all these decisions the administrators were also seen as participating more than teachers did. The decisions where the participation of administrators was not felt to be excessive were: deciding to remove a child from class, determining controversial classroom content, the availability of guidance material, school representation in the local community, the use of teacher preparation periods, permanent record card entries, faculty teaching assignments, and integrating school-community needs. Of these, only with respect to school representation in the local community, faculty teaching assignments, and the integration of school-community needs were administrators seen actually participating more than teacher. Of the fourteen decisions studied, there was not one example where larger percentages of teachers than administrators were perceived as participating.

---

[2] Sufficient data were returned for only seven of the nine decision on each Form.

## TABLE 60

## RESPONSES TO DECISION-MAKING QUESTIONNAIRE BY FORM

| Form I | Prop. of Resp. Who Believe Administrator | | Prop. of Resp. Who Believe Teacher | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decision | Should Partic. | Does Part. | Should Partic. | Does Part. |
| Teacher Orient. | 40 | 67 | 26 | 9 |
| Lesson Plan Evaluation | 47 | 64 | 42 | 28 |
| Removal of Child from Class | 34 | 42 | 34 | 33 |
| Controversial Classroom Content | 37 | 41 | 46 | 57 |
| Avail. of Guidance Material | 41 | 51 | 37 | 37 |
| Sch. Repres. in Local Commun. | 30 | 41 | 24 | 12 |
| Use of Teacher Prep. Periods | 38 | 38 | 52 | 55 |
| Mean Proportion | 38 | 48 | 36 | 33 |

| Form II | Prop. of Resp. Who Believe Administrator | | Prop. of Resp. Who Believe Teacher | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decision | Should Partic. | Does Part. | Should Partic. | Does Part. |
| Non-Teaching Assign. of Tch.-Specialist | 52 | 70 | 39 | 30 |
| Permanent Record Card Entries | 27 | 28 | 34 | 36 |
| Faculty Teaching Assignment | 55 | 67 | 37 | 31 |
| Curriculum Evaluation | 35 | 52 | 30 | 20 |
| Curriculum Revision | 29 | 45 | 30 | 24 |
| School Organization | 41 | 60 | 37 | 28 |
| Integrate sch.-commun. Needs | 30 | 41 | 29 | 19 |
| Mean Proportion | 36 | 49 | 33 | 27 |

## The Decision Maker

Table 61 presents the data from Forms I and II, on the respondents' perception of the actual act of decision-making. As might have been expected, they saw administrators making decisions more often than they should and teachers less often, particularly in decision involving teacher orientation, evaluation of lesson plans, removal of child from class, controversial classroom content, availability of guidance material, faculty assignments, school organization, and aspects of curricular evaluation. Only concerning the use of teacher preparation periods did larger proportions of respondents believe that teachers rather than administrators made the decisions.

These data also indicate that the respondents, all teachers themselves, were not asking for exclusive decision-making power, but rather for a share in the power. For 9 of the 14 decisions noted in Table 61, at least half the respondents believed that the administrator should continue to be the/a decision maker.

## Role Description

One feature of ME schools is additional regular and specialized staff. As part of the 1967-68 evaluation this year's evaluation team chose to study the manner by which school functions were distributed among the various school role positions.

The Role Description Questionnaire was devised to provide descriptions of the duties and responsibilities of selected positions, from two vantage points: the person within-the-role, and the person without-the-role. Comparisons, both among and between within-and without-the-role respondents, were planned for each school and for ME and C/SS schools as groups. As noted earlier, an insufficient number of returns, however, dictated modifications in these plans. Instead of the eleven roles originally selected for study, data are available for only five and then only for ME schools and for without-the-role perceptions. The duties that the respondents ascribed to each role are listed in Appendix A, Tables A1 through A5. In using these data the reader is cautioned to remember the low incidence of returns and recognize that these are preliminary findings only and cannot be generalized or considered representative of the roles as they function in ME schools. They are presented only for their possible value in structuring further studies of roles.

## TABLE 61

## IDENTIFICATION OF DECISION-MAKER, BY FORM

| **Form I** | **Prop. of Resp. Who Believe Administrator** | | **Prop. of Resp. Who Believe Teachers** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Decision** | **Should Decide** | **Does Dec.** | **Should Decide** | **Does Dec.** |
| **Teacher Orient.** | 65 | 97 | 12 | -- |
| **Lesson Plan Evaluation** | 64 | 94 | 52 | 13 |
| **Removal of Child from Class** | 56 | 100 | 35 | 7 |
| **Controversial Classroom Content** | 37 | 73 | 60 | 50 |
| **Avail. of Guidance Material** | 30 | 54 | 13 | 8 |
| **School Repres. in Local Commun.** | 65 | 78 | 39 | 22 |
| **Use of Teacher Prep. Periods** | 29 | 35 | 68 | 65 |
| **Mean Proportion** | 57 | 76 | 46 | 24 |

| **Form II** | **Prop. of Resp. Who Believe Administrator** | | **Prop. of Resp. Who Believe Teacher** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Decision** | **Should Decide** | **Does Dec.** | **Should Decide** | **Does Dec.** |
| **Non-Teaching Assign. of Tch.-Specialist** | 65 | 65 | 39 | 19 |
| **Permanent Record Card Entries** | 43 | 46 | 53 | 43 |
| **Faculty Teaching Assignment** | 73 | 96 | 37 | 14 |
| **Curriculum Evaluation** | 50 | 73 | 43 | 15 |
| **Curriculum Revision** | 50 | 61 | 33 | 11 |
| **School Organization** | 76 | 100 | 34 | 14 |
| **Integrate Sch.-Commun. Needs** | 36 | 48 | 32 | 40 |
| **Mean Proportion** | 56 | 73 | 39 | 22 |

# CHAPTER XI

# CONCLUSIONS

The 1967-68 evaluation of the More Effective Schools program sought to assess the program in terms of three criterion areas: 1) the extent to which the program's constituent elements were in fact present in the participating schools; 2) the extent to which the instructional process in the ME schools differed from and qualitatively was comparable to that in the Control and Special Service schools; and 3) the extent to which, on varied criteria of children's attitudinal and cognitive functioning, the educational product of ME schools differed from that of the C and SS schools.

The first criterion area of the study indicated that the majority of the administrative and structural changes originally recommended in the report of the Planning Committee continued to characterize the ME schools. The suggested limitations on class size were being observed, the suggested addition of specialized staff had been implemented, and although there was some variation in the number of hours, supplementary personnel, too, were provided. There were still no consistent provisions to provide education for three year olds, nor to handle the discontinuity when a child's family moves out of the neighborhood, but overall, the conclusion we have drawn is that in terms of the administrative and structural components, the MES program had been implemented.

More important are the findings that,in terms of educational process as well, the MES program was implemented more thoroughly than previous evaluations have found. The observers in this evaluation, for the first time in three evaluations, felt that the small classes in the ME schools were being used with consistent good effect. Specialists were used widely for instruction. Moreover, the analysis of in-class activity found that although the general areas of content were similar in all types of schools, the ME schools more often used grouping, more often provided instruction at different levels, and did on occasion provide extra-class instruction, a practice seldom seen in the comparison schools.

In addition to these differences in process,the ratings of the observational team of educators as in previous years were positive and even laudatory regarding aspects of overall school functioning, particularly in the area of climate and attitude. In these same areas we found positive qualitative evaluations by parents. When all of the differences are combined we develop a profile of the ME school in 1967-68 as a school in which staff and children relate well to each other, to which parents and observers alike are (or would be) pleased to send their children, and in which the instructional process is characterized by more frequent application of many of the organizational techniques currently considered good teaching practice.

This positive profile makes the lack of consistent progress in the academic areas disappointing. The overall level of achievement in the ME schools in arithmetic is no better than it was in 1966-67 or 1965-66, and in reading, the Old ME schools were not consistently different than they had been at the end of the first year of the program although better in some grades than in 1966-67. Consistent progress was shown by the New ME schools, however, where higher levels of achievement in reading were evidenced in all grades but grade 3 in comparison both to the first year of the program and to 1966-67. The lack of consistency, then, is the conclusion we draw; that while there is no evidence of progress in arithmetic, there is some in reading, but even this is not consistent across grade or by type of ME school.

The possible interaction of innovation and progress points up one limitation to the 1967-68 evaluation; that the lack of time made it impossible for the evaluation to do the separate school-by-school analyses of the data which had been planned, in time to be included in this report. Since the statistical measures of deviation suggest the same kind of variation from school to school this year, which had been noted in the 1966-67 evaluation, this kind of analysis is one which should be planned in the future evaluations of the program.

That the MES program as it has been implemented for the past several years in New York City is not an immediate and consistent solution to the problems of retardation in the academic areas is a clear conclusion from the data of this and previous evaluations. That there were some indications of differential functioning this year is also clear. When one seeks to understand why there was not a more widespread consistent evidence of improvement, one remembers that one of the conclusions drawn by this evaluation team in its 1966-67 evaluation of the MES program, as well as by a different team in its evaluation of the 1965-66 year, was that, in several of its basic instructional components, the program had not been widely implemented. Much of the observational data from this 1967-68 evaluation indicate that these components were implemented during this year. In the sense of the instructional process in class, then, 1967-68 more closely approximates the teaching model of the More Effective Schools program than either 1965-66 or 1966-67, and so the MES program may have had its first full instructional year in 1967-68. If these instructional modifications are valid, and if they continue, one may legitimately expect to see more consistent "pay-off" in terms of improved pupil functioning in future evaluations.

# APPENDIX A

## TABLES

| Table No. | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| A1 | Perceptions of Duties of Guidance Counselor | A2 |
| A2 | Auxiliary Teacher | A3 |
| A3 | Corrective Reading Teacher | A4 |
| A4 | Administrative Assistant | A5 |
| A5 | Community Relations Coordinator | A6 |

## Table A1

### Perceptions of Duties of Guidance Counselor

### ME Schools Only

| Duty | N=25<br>Number Listing Role |
|---|---|
| Direct Faculty-Guidance Counselor Interaction | 27 |
| Meeting with and Counseling Students | 32 |
| Conferring with Parents | 18 |
| Social Agency Contacts | 14 |
| Screening and Testing Students | 9 |
| Classroom Instruction | 3 |
| School-School Liaison | 3 |
| Record Keeping | 5 |
| School-Community Liaison | 2 |

## Table A2

## Perceptions of Duties of Auxiliary Teacher

| Duty | N=24 Without-the-Role Responses |
|---|---|
| School-Community Liaison | 45 |
| Small Group Instruction | 21 |
| Meeting with and Counseling Students | 18 |
| Direct Faculty-Auxiliary Teacher Interaction | 11 |
| Conferring with Parents | 9 |
| Social Agency Contacts | 6 |
| Screening and Testing | 1 |

### Table A3

### Perceptions of Duties of Corrective Reading Teachers

| Duty | N=18 Without-the-Role Responses |
|---|---|
| Small and large group instruction | 25 |
| Individualized Reading Instruction | 8 |
| Direct Corrective Reading Teacher-Faculty Interaction | 7 |
| Screening and Testing Students | 5 |
| Record Keeping | 5 |
| Conferring with Parents | 4 |
| Classroom Instruction | 2 |

### Table A4

### Perceptions of Duties of Administrative Assistant

| Duty | N=26 Without-the-Role Responses |
|---|---|
| Scheduling Class and Staff Assignments | 35 |
| Conducting School Surveys and Evaluations | 26 |
| Staff Supervision | 25 |
| Supply Maintenance | 18 |
| Managing School Monies | 15 |
| Human Resource to Staff | 5 |
| Conferring with Parents | 4 |
| Miscellaneous | 7 |

Table A5

Perceptions of Duties of
Community Relations Coordinator

| Duty | N=31 Without-the-Role Responses |
|---|---|
| School-Community Liaison | 99 |
| Conferring with Parents | 24 |
| Meeting with and Counseling Students | 3 |
| Classroom Instruction | 2 |
| Student-Teacher Liaison | 1 |

# APPENDIX B

## INSTRUMENTS

Letter to Participating Schools B2

Facilities Questionnaire B3

MES Assistant Principal Interview Form B8

Code Sheet for Activity Study B12

Letter to Classroom Teacher Describing Activity Study B16

Activity Description Form B17

Classroom Interruption Schedule B18

General School Report B19

Individual Lesson Observation Report Prekindergarten - First Grade B22

Individual Lesson Observation Report Elementary B27

Student Self-Image Inventory Form B34

Role Description Questionnaire "My Duties as a Specialist in an ME School" B40

Role Description Questionnaire "The Duties of a            in an ME School" B41

Decision-Making Study B42

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

More Effective Schools Program

February 15, 1968

Dear Colleague:

The Center for Urban Education, under contract with the Board of Education, is continuing its evaluation of the E.S.E.A. Title I More Effective Schools program and has designated me Evaluation Chairman. Authorization for our evaluation was given by Dr. Nathan Brown in General Circular No. 8 1967-8.

Our basic design for this year's evaluation study encompasses four aspects: Class and activity observations; testing children, i.e., verbal fluency; administering questionnaires to staff and parents; and collecting data from school records.

At the present time we would appreciate it if you would send us a copy of your school organization sheet by return mail so that we can select the classes for our study. We would also be grateful if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible. Two self-addressed, stamped envelopes are enclosed for your convenience.

I would like to thank you for the cooperation you extended me and my research staff during last year's study, and assure you that our staff will do their utmost to complete our work at your school as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Mrs. Lorraine Flaum, our Research Coordinator, will telephone you shortly to arrange mutually convenient dates for these visits. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call us at 862-7300 and speak with Mrs. Flaum or with me.

Sincerely yours,

David J. Fox, Associate Professor
Director, Office of Research and
Evaluation Services
City College
Evaluation Chairman, MES

encl:
questionnaire
2 self-addressed, stamped envelopes

# CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
# FACILITIES INSTRUMENT
## Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program

1967 - 1968

Part of the responsibility of the 1967-68 evaluation of the MES Program is to bring up to date the extent to which certain elements of the MES Program have been implemented. We appreciate your cooperation in completing this questionnaire and if you have any questions concerning any of the items on this form, please feel free to call Miss Valerie Barnes at 862-7002.

NAME AND POSITION OF PERSON COMPLETING FORM________________________________

SCHOOL______________________ NUMBER OF YEARS AT THIS SCHOOL__________

1. How many classes are there in your school for:
   a) three year old children_____ b) average size of each class _____
   c) four year old children _____ d) average size of each class _____

2. a) What is the earliest time at which there is a teacher on duty in the morning? __________
   b) At what time does the morning session begin? _________
   c) 1) Does your school close at the same time every day? (Circle one) YES NO
      2) If yes, at what time does it officially close? __________
      3) If no, please list closing times for each day:

3. a) Are there ungraded blocs of grades in your school?
      1) Yes
      2) No

   b) If yes: which grades are incorporated in the blocs? (Circle more than one if applicable)
      1) Early Childhood
      2) Grades 3 or 4
      3) Grades 5 or 6

4. In its 1966 report on MES, the Board of Education referred to one of the original goals of the MES Program that "efforts will be made to overcome the effects of pupil and family mobility through closer cooperation with the Department of Housing, the Department of Welfare and other social agencies. In addition, adjustments will be made in the present transfer regulations to encourage pupils to remain in their schools." The report indicated that this goal had not been implemented by 1966. At the present time, does your school make an effort to retain children when their family moves to a different neighborhood?
   a) No, because:

   b) Yes, we:

5. a) Is your school officially a "campus school?"

   1) Yes; we are affiliated with:

   2) No

   b) Do you have teacher training programs in conjunction with any of the colleges in NYC?

   1) No (Go on to Question 6)

   2) Yes, with:

   c) How many teachers are involved in the program? ___________

   d) Please explain the nature of the program:

6. a) Are all your classrooms fully utilized for instructional purposes?

   1) Yes

   2) No

   b) If no, how many are not used? _________

   Please specify reasons why:

7. a) Do you have closed circuit TV?

   1) Yes

   2) No

   b) If yes, how many classrooms does it reach?

   c) Which instructional areas does it cover?

8. Please indicate which of the following pieces of audio-visual equipment you have and which you have acquired since September 1967.

| Equipment | Number Have Now | Number New Since September 1967 |
|---|---|---|
| 1. 16mm. Sound Motion Picture Projector | | |
| 2. Film Strip Projector | | |
| 3. Film Strip Viewers | | |
| 4. Overhead Projectors | | |
| 5. 3¼ x 4 Slide Projectors | | |
| 6. 3¼ x 4 Opaque Projectors | | |
| 7. Tape Recorders (with earphone sets and connection boxes) | | |
| 8. Phonographs | | |
| 9. Radio Receivers | | |
| 10. TV Receivers | | |
| 11. Cameras | | |

12. Other: (List Below)

9. Please indicate the extent to which the school plant is used at each of the following times:

| | TIME | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extent of use | 3PM-5PM | 5PM-7PM | 7PM-10PM | Sat. | Sun. | Summer Day School | Summer Day Camp |
| Full Capacity | | | | | | | |
| Half Capacity but less than full | | | | | | | |
| Some, but less than half | | | | | | | |
| None | | | | | | | |

10. Consider the role of your Community Relations Coordinator. Indicate the percentage of his time he devotes to each of the following functions, so that you account for 100% of his time.

| a) Function | % of Time Allotted |
|---|---|
| 1) Out in community | ________% |
| 2) In school -- on community oriented activities (i.e., meeting with parents) | ________% |
| 3) In school -- meeting with teachers | ________% |
| 4) In school -- meeting with other staff (i.e., administration, guidance counselor, etc.) | ________% |
| 5) In school -- clerical aspects of job | ________% |
| 6) In school -- on other school related activities | ________% |
| 7) Other: List below | |
| a ________________________________ | ________% |
| b ________________________________ | ________% |
| c ________________________________ | ________% |

b) We have no community relations coordinator because:

11. Approximately how many hours have you been allocated for 1967-68 of services of:

| | |
|---|---|
| a) School aides | ____________ |
| b) Teacher aides -- Pre Kindergarten | ____________ |
| c) Teacher aides -- Kindergarten | ____________ |
| d) Audio-Visual aides | ____________ |

12. The proposal for MES in 1967-68 lists the positions below. Of course not all schools are to receive each person listed. So that we can evaluate the extent to which this aspect of the program has been implemented, please indicate the number of specialists who are full or part-time members of your staff and the number who have been added or lost from your staff in 1967-68.

| Function | Total Number Now on Full-time Staff | Total Number Now on Part-Time Staff (Indicate time in 1/5's) | Grades Instructed | Number Added in 1967-1968 | Number Lost in 1967-1968 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Cluster Teacher | | | | | |
| 2. Junior Guidance | | | | | |
| 3. Community Relations Coordinator | | | | | |
| 4. School Psychologist | | | | | |
| 5. Music Teacher | | | | | |
| 6. Health Education Teacher | | | | | |
| 7. Audio Visual Teacher | | | | | |
| 8. Art Teacher | | | | | |
| 9. Reading Improvement Teacher | | | | | |
| 10. Language Resource Teacher | | | | | |
| 11. Health Counselor | | | | | |
| 12. Speech Teacher | | | | | |
| 13. Science Teacher | | | | | |
| 14. Industrial Arts Teacher | | | | | |
| 15. Corrective Reading Teacher | | | | | |
| 16. Librarian | | | | | |
| 17. Administrative Assistant | | | | | |
| 18. Social Worker | | | | | |
| 19. Physician | | | | | |
| 20. Psychiatrist | | | | | |
| 21. Guidance Counselor | | | | | |
| 22. Language Arts Teacher | | | | | |
| 23. Other (list below) | | | | | |

# CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

## More Effective Schools Program

## MES ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

School________Borough________Date___________Interviewer_______________________

Name_______________________________________________M____F____Approx. Age__________

1. Years of Experience___________

2. Years at this school__________ 3. Years as AP_______________

4. If prior experience, at what school_______________________________________

5. For how long? _______________

6. In what capacity? (position) _________________# of years_________________

(position) _________________# of years_________________

---

1. Please list your responsibilities during the past academic year.

2. What do you do in the area of teacher training?

3. (Interviewer: Ask if #2 is answered. Otherwise go to #4.) Please give me a specific instance in which you feel you did an effective job of teacher training. Tell me what you did and why you feel it was effective.

4/68

4. If no teacher training, why not?

5. What do you do in the area of instruction supervision?

6. Please give a specific instance of how you supervise instruction.

7. Has there been any innovation of teaching methodology during the years you've supervised the grades you now supervise?

1) Yes______ 2) No______

8. If yes, what?

9. How is the curriculum selected for the grade?

10. Does it differ in any significant way from the standard curriculum?

1) Yes______ 2) No______ 3) Don't know______

(Interviewer: If answer to #10 is "yes", ask #11 and #12. If answer is "no", go on to #13)

11. If yes, how?

MES AP Interview

12. If yes, how are these differences determined?

13. If there are no deviations, why not?

14. Do all the third grade teachers use the same curriculum?

1) Yes______ 2) No______

(Interviewer: If answer to #14 is "yes", go on to #17. If "no", go on to #15)

15. If no, why?

16. If no, what are the variations?

17. If you had the time and the staff to make up your own curriculum for this school, in what respects would it differ from what you are doing now?

18. Are there things you do in your job here which you think APs could not do in a non-MES school?

1) Yes______ 2) No______ 3) Don't know______

19. If yes, what?

3

20. Is there anything you're not doing in your job that you'd like to do? Why aren't you doing it?

21. What things do the teachers you supervise do which they couldn't do in a non-MES school?

22. Is there anything the teachers are not doing that you'd like them to do?

1) Yes______ 2) No______

23. If yes, what?

Center for Urban Education
Evaluation of More Effective Schools Program
1967-1968

## CODE SHEET FOR ACTIVITY STUDY

Listed below are codes for responses to be entered under the columns and sub-column heading on the Activity Scale.

TIME SPENT: Enter time the activity (or whichever code is entered on the line) began under "FROM" and the time the activity ended under "TO."

ACTIVITY:

01=Opening exercises. Includes flag exercises; attendance; planning day's schedule; announcements; collections; public address system; pupil inspection.
02=Reading
03=Mathematics
04=Social Studies
05=Science
06=Spelling
07=Correct Usage (grammar)
08=Penmanship
09=Composition
10=Creative writing and/or poetry
11=Speech: expressing ideas
12=Speech: pronunciation
13=Arts/Crafts
14=Music
15=Physical Education. Includes physical activities; dancing; health instruction; safety
16=Library
17=Assembly (attending)
18=Rehearsal or presentation of an assembly program
19=Dramatics
20=Snack (milk)
21=Rest period
22=Closing exercises
23=Other. Indicate the activity

WHO'S IN ROOM:

A) In sub-column A, indicate the teacher(s) present in the room.

00=No teacher present in room during activity
01=Regular/Official teacher
02=Cluster teacher
04=Specialist
08=Student teacher
16=Teacher aide
32=Substitute teacher

If there is more than one teacher present in the room, enter the SUM of the code numbers of those teachers. Thus, if both the regular teacher and the cluster teacher are present throughout the activity, 03 would be entered in sub-column A. If one teacher is present, then just that one code number is entered.

B) In sub-column B, indicate the number of children who left the room and the number of children who entered the room only for the departmental period. Thus, if 12 children left and 10 entered at the change of the period, record 12/10. All other recordings of children leaving or entering the room should be entered on the separate form.

C) In sub-column C, indicate which group of children are present in the room.
1-Regular official class as a total group
2-Class organized for this activity only, homogeneously grouped for this subject
3-Class organized for this activity only,but not necessarily homogeneously grouped
4-More than one class grouped together for this activity

NUMBER OF LEVELS OF INSTRUCTION:
1-One. All children receive the instruction on the same level
2-Two different instructional levels employed
3-Three or four different instructional levels employed
4-Most children receiving different instructional levels-no more than two or three children working on any one level
9-Unable to ascertain at present time (Note: check with teacher later and fill in appropriate code but do not delete the 9).

INDIVIDUAL WORK: Individual work refers to the children who are working alone.
A) In sub-column A, enter the number of children who are working individually

B) Entries in sub-column B refer to the nature of the individual work.
01=Teacher prepared assignments. Includes worksheets, problems orally dictated or written on the blackboard, etc.
02=Silent reading
03=Workbooks
04=Art work
05=Homework
06=Programmed instruction
07=Individual reading conference with teacher
08=Test
09=Other: Indicate nature of work

It is possible that several of the above could occur during one activity. Each code should be entered in the order in which it occurred using separate lines as necessary. If entries are made for the whole class (i.e., everyone is working individually) then nothing should be recorded under the "whole class" column (following column).

C) Entries in sub-column C refer to who assigned the individual work.
1=Teacher assigned work
2=Pupil choice of work
3=Combination of 1 and 2

TYPE OF GROUP:
0=No provision made for any group work during activity
1=Non-interacting and scattered around classroom; no members of the group in each other's presence
2=Non-interacting but children working in each other's presence(i.e.,same or adjacent desk
3=Interacting group working together on a group assigned activity; all seated together

SUPERVISOR: The supervisor is the teacher who is in charge of the activity.
00=No supervisor
01=Regular/Official teacher
02=Cluster teacher
04=Specialist
08=Student teacher
16=Teacher Aide

NATURE OF TEACHER/CHILD INTERACTION:
0=No teacher/child interaction
1=Teacher directed-lecture with no discussion or questions
2=Teacher directed-with some discussions and questions
3=Teacher directed-primarily questions
4=Teacher circulating around classroom-observing children
5=Teacher circulating around classroom-assisting individual children
6=Child directed-primarily lecture
7=Child directed-primarily discussion
8=Individual children reading aloud

It is possible that more than one of the above will occur during one activity. Each code should be entered in the order in which it occurred using separate lines for each new entry.

MATERIALS EMPLOYED:
00=No materials employed during lesson
01-Use of audio-visual equipment (specify under comments)
02=Use of blackboard (either by children and/or teacher)
04=Pupil prepared materials
08=Teacher prepared materials/assignments (i.e.,worksheets,etc.Specify)
16=Use of pictures, posters, etc.
32=Use of reading materials (i.e., textbooks, newspapers, etc. Specify)

If more than one of the above are utilized during the lesson, enter the SUM of the code numbers. A separate line for a change in materials is not necessary.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

1. The columns headed "second group" and "third group" are intended for those activities in which there are more than one group (i.e.,the whole class). If the whole class participates in the activity, the spaces for groups 2 and 3 will be left blank.

2. You will probably find it helpful to ask the teacher questions concerning the destination of children leaving the room, the identification of other teachers, etc. If the teacher is willing, try to see her plan book for the day (or ask her about the day's schedule) so you will have some idea of what to expect.

3. You are to remain in the room with the official class unless more than half of the class leaves the room together for the same destination and is not replaced by a comparable number of children. Thus, a majority of the class may leave for departmental instruction, but they may split into several small groups and go to several classrooms and a similar number of children will replace them in the room. You are to remain in the room when this occurs. However, if, for example, most of the class is taken to the library and only a few children stay in the room, then you are to follow the group to the library.

4. If any of the codes are not entered in the column, record a 0 in the space.

5. The purpose of this study is to record a detailed account of what occurs in the classroom for the entire day. Thus, your recordings are to be as specific and detailed as possible. Use new lines for changes in activity and all other codes (except materials employed) indicating always the time at which these occurred. When a new line is used to indicate a change in one code, "'s may be used under those columns where the codes remain the same.

6. If you believe an additional code in any category is necessary, make a detailed note for later reference but do not add code numbers.

7. Be sure to complete the information at the top of the form. The class registration is the official size of the class while the attendance is the number of children present that day. Usually this information is recorded on the blackboard; if not, ask the teacher.

## CODING INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORM 2

The purpose of this form is to keep an ongoing record of the number of children who enter or leave the classroom for the entire day.

TIME: Enter the time the children leave or enter the room. A separate line should be used for each time entry.

ACTIVITY: The activity during which the children leave or enter. Use the same codes on page 1.

NO.CHILDREN LEAVING: Record the number of children who left the room. Label each new entry with a letter in alphabetical order. For example, the first group (or child) who leaves is entered as A3(3 left), the next is B..,C.. etc. When A3 returns, it is recorded under the entering column as A3.

NO.CHILDREN ENTERING: The children who enter are either those who left and are returning or those who enter and then leave. If the children are returning, then the same letter which was used to record their departure is used to record their entry. On the other hand, a new letter (in continued alphabetical order) is recorded if the children first enter and then leave. Thus, if the first entry is A3 and then 1 child enters, B1 is recorded in this column. If the A3 returns after B1, then A3 follows B1 in the ENTERING Column. When B1 leaves, it is recorded under the LEAVING column.

DESTINATION/REASON: With the exception of children leaving the room for personal reasons (i.e.,bathroom or drink of water), every other destination should be recorded. Children who leave or enter for departmentalized periods, individual instruction, errands, etc., should all be recorded. If the destination is not clear to you at the time, be sure to ask the teacher where they went at a later time.

Center for Urban Education
Evaluation of More Effective Schools Program
1967-1968

Dear

As you probably already know, the Center for Urban Education is presently evaluating the More Effective Schools Program of the New York City Board of Education.

One part of the current evaluation is an examination of the daily activities in the classrooms of the schools in the project. This Activity Study is designed to record the ongoing classroom activities of one class for an entire school day. Your class has been selected to be one of those studied, and an observer will visit your class to spend a day with you and the children.

The function of the observer who will spend a day in your class will be to record purely descriptive and factual information relating to the activities of the class. No qualitative ratings pertaining to the teacher's or children's performance will be made. You are welcome to see the forms which will be used to record the data for the Activity Study.

I hope that this aspect of our evaluation will not inconvenience you or the routine of your class. Should you wish to contact us about this phase of the study, feel free to call Miss Valerie Barnes at 862-7002.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,
David J Fox
David J. Fox
Evaluation Chairman
More Effective Schools Program

DJF:vb

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
EVALUATION OF MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM: DESCRIPTIVE ACTIVITY STUDY

School________________

Class________________ Official Class Teacher________________ Class Registration________ Attendance________ Observer____________

Date________________

| TIME SPENT FROM TO | ACTIV-ITY | WHO'S IN ROOM | | | NO. LEV. INS. | INDIV. WORK | | | WHOLE CLASS(1st GP.) | | | | | SECOND GROUP | | | | | THIRD GROUP | | | | | COMMENTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | TY. GP. | NO. CHN. INV. | SUP. | T/C INT | MAT EMP | TY. GP. | NO. CHN. INV. | SUP. | T/C INT | MAT EMP | TY. GP. | NO. CHN. INV. | SUP. | T/C INT | MAT EMP | |
| | | A | B | C | | A | B | C | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Center for Urban Education
Evaluation of More Effective Schools Program
Descriptive Activity Study
Form 2

School____________ Class____________ Official Class Teacher____________________

Class Registration__________ Attendance_________ Observer_________________ Date________

| TIME | ACTIVITY | NO. CHILDREN LEAVING ROOM | NO. CHILDREN ENTERING ROOM | DESTINATION/REASON |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

## CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

## MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

### General School Report at the End of the First Visit

School________ Borough_____________ Date_________ Observer______________

1. How would you rate the attractiveness of the building?

    1. extremely attractive
    2. of greater than average attractiveness
    3. average
    4. of less than average attractiveness
    5. generally unattractive

2. How would you rate the general attractiveness of the classrooms you have seen?

    1. consistently very attractive
    2. most rooms attractive
    3. some classrooms attractive
    4. most of the classrooms were unattractive
    5. classrooms were consistently unattractive

3. What is the general school climate?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

4. What was the general attitude of the teaching staff toward the children?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

5. How would you rate the attitude of the administrative staff?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

6. How would you rate the attitude of the supplementary teaching and service staff?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

7. What was the general attitude of the children toward the teaching staff?

    1. extremely positive
    2. positive
    3. average
    4. negative
    5. extremely negative

8. How would you characterize discipline in these classes?

    1. Sufficient control and quiet for excellent learning atmosphere
    2. Sufficient control and quiet for a good learning atmosphere
    3. Sufficient control and quiet for an average learning atmosphere
    4. Lack of sufficient control and quiet for an average learning atmosphere
    5. Too chaotic and noisy for learning.

9. What seemed to be the single most effective feature of MES in the classrooms you visited?

    ________________________________________________________________

    ________________________________________________________________

10. What other effective features did you see?

11. What, if any, special classroom problems do you think are particular to MES, or especially acute in this MES school?

12. If the instruction you have seen was typical of MES schools, how would you feel about having a child of your own enrolled in a MES school.

    1. enthusiastic
    2. definitely positive, but not enthusiastic
    3. slightly positive
    4. slightly negative
    5. strongly negative

13. If these classes were typical of the quality of instruction in all MES schools, how would you feel about the MES program in general?

    1. Retain as is
    2. Slightly change
    3. Strongly modify
    4. Abolish

14. Please give further explanation of your above answer.

15. Assuming the pupil day in the average school costs $X, how much was the pupil day you saw worth?

    1. Less than X
    2. X
    3. More than X

16. Additional general comments.

# CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

## MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

## Pre-Kindergarten - 1st Grade
## INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT

School_______________ Borough_________ Grade________ Class ______ Date___________

Teacher's Name________________________ Sex _____ Observer ____________________

Length of Class Observation ____________________

1. How would you describe the teacher's overall handling of the children's spontaneous questions?

   1. Questions were welcomed and built on.
   2. Questions were answered cursorily.
   3. Questions were ignored.
   4. Opportunity for spontaneous questions was there but few or none were asked. Why? ______________________________
   8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

2. What was the overall participation of children?

   1. Every or almost every child was actively involved.
   2. More than half participated.
   3. About half participated.
   4. Fewer than half participated.
   5. Very few or none participated.
   8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

3. What was the children's general understanding of the teacher's spoken word?

   1. Every or almost every child understood fully.
   2. More than half understood.
   3. About half the children understood fully.
   4. Less than half the children understood.
   5. Very few or no children understood.

4. How would you describe the overall verbal fluency of the children who participated?

   1. Articulated clearly with correct grammar.
   2. Articulated clearly with some grammatical errors.
   3. Articulated clearly with many grammatical errors.
   4. Articulated indistinctly with correct grammar.
   5. Articulated indistinctly with some grammatical errors.
   6. Articulated indistinctly with many grammatical errors.
   8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

5. How would you describe the verbal communication among the children?

   1. Articulated clearly with correct grammar.
   2. Articulated clearly with some grammatical errors.
   3. Articulated clearly with many grammatical errors.
   4. Articulated indistinctly with correct grammar.
   5. Articulated indistinctly with some grammatical errors.
   6. Articulated indistinctly with many grammatical errors.
   8. Not relevant. Explain: ________________________________________

6. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with the children?

   1. Always or almost always spoke to the children on their level of understanding.
   2. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding more than half the time.
   3. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding about half the time.
   4. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding less than half the time.
   5. Seldom or never spoke to the children on their level of understanding.

7. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with Non-English speaking children?

   1. Communicates with ease.
   2. Communicates with some difficulty.
   3. Communicates with great difficulty.
   8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

8. How would you describe the overall relationship among the children?

   1. All or almost all the children seem to get along well with others as a total class.
   2. All or almost all the children seem to get along well with some of the others with evidence of small social cliques.
   3. More than half of the children seem to get along well with others.
   4. About half the children seem to get along well with others.
   5. Less than half the children seem to get along well with others.
   6. Very few or no children seem to get along well with others.

9. How would you describe the overall Teacher-Pupil relationship?

   1. Teacher seems to get along well with all or almost all the pupils.
   2. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, ignoring the rest.
   3. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, and shows an overt distaste for some.
   4. Teacher seems to get along well with about half the pupils.
   5. Teacher seems to get along well with less than half the pupils.
   6. Teacher seems to get along well with very few or none of the pupils.

10. How would you rate the overall quality of instruction?

    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

11. How would you rate the classroom's appearance?

    1. Extremely attractive
    2. Of greater than average attractiveness
    3. Average
    4. Less than average attractiveness
    5. Unattractive

    Additional observations ______________________________________

    ______________________________________________________________

12. How would you describe the classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?

    1. Undisciplined and warm
    2. Undisciplined and cold
    3. Disciplined yet congenial or warm
    4. Disciplined and cold
    5. Overdisciplined yet warm
    6. Overdisciplined and cold

Additional comments:

School______________ Borough_____________ Class____________ Observer_______________

Activity _______________________________________

Conducted from (time)____________ to __________

13. Who conducted this activity?

    1. Regular classroom teacher
    2. Cluster teacher
    3. Substitute teacher
    4. Special staff (indicate who) _______________________
    5. Other (indicate who) ______________________________

14. Approximate number of children in teaching unit ___________

    a) If less than total class, what were others doing? ______________________

    ______________________________________________________________

15. How typical do you think this activity was of normal classroom functioning?

1. Completely typical
2. Reasonable approximation
3. Atypical Explain:________________________________________

16. Amount of planning and organization evident in this activity?

1. Exceptionally well organized and planned.
2. Well organized and planned but not exceptionally so.
3. Well organized and showed some evidence of planning.
4. Not organized but showed some signs of previous teacher planning.
5. Showed few or no signs of organization or planning.

17. Was concept development employed? Explain.

1. Yes
2. No

Explain:__________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

18. Level of creativity and imagination evident in this activity.

1. Extremely creative
2. Predominately creative
3. Equally creative and stereotyped
4. More stereotyped than creative
5. Extremely stereotyped

19. If you rated the activity as "extremely" creative, or "predominately" creative, please explain why.

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

20. Use of the children's background and experience evident in this activity?

1. Consistent opportunities for children to relate activity to their own background.
2. Consistent opportunities for children to bring experience to activity.
3. Some opportunity for children to relate activity to their own background.
4. Some opportunity for children to use experience in activity.
5. Activity was remote from children's experience.
8. Not relevant. Explain:________________________________________

21. To what extent, and how effectively were teaching aids utilized?

1. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively.
2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively.
3. Some used and used creatively and effectively.
4. Some used but not particularly effectively.
5. Little or no use of teaching aids.
8. Not relevant. Explain:________________________________________

22. Amount of material covered?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
8. Not relevant. Explain:______________________________

23. How would you rate the depth of instruction?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
8. Not relevant. Explain:______________________________

24. How many children showed interest and enthusiasm?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half of the children.
3. Half of the children.
4. Fewer than half of the children.
5. Few or no children.
8. Not relevant. Explain:______________________________

25. How many children raised spontaneous questions?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. About half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Few or no children.

26. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. About half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Very few or no children.
8. Not relevant. Explain:______________________________

27. Had this activity been duplicated with a class size of 30-35, what would have happened to its effectiveness?

1. Larger class would have completely destroyed effectiveness.
2. Larger class size would have seriously impeded effectiveness.
3. Activity would have been somewhat less effective in a larger class.
4. There would have been no loss of effectiveness.

## CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

## MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

## INDIVIDUAL LESSON OBSERVATION REPORT
## ELEMENTARY

School______________ Borough______________ Grade________ Class_______ Date________________

Teacher's Name____________________________ Sex________ Observer_____________________________

Length of Observation____________________ Activities Observed___________________________

If this is a joint observation, check here_______ and record the name of other observer _____________________________. Joint observations should be reported by each observer without consultation.

1. Content of lesson observed.

    1. Reading
    2. Spelling
    3. Math
    4. Science
    5. Social Studies
    6. Music
    7. Art
    8. Other______________________________________________________________________

2. Who taught this lesson?

    1. Regular teacher
    2. Cluster teacher
    3. Substitute teacher
    4. Special staff (indicate who) ____________________________________________
    5. Other______________________________________________________________________

3. Did you see entire lesson?

    1. Yes
    2. No, I missed the beginning
    3. No, I missed the end

4. Approximate number of children in teaching unit________________

    a) If less than the total class, what were the other children doing?

    ____________________________________________________________________________

3/68

5. How typical do you think this lesson was of normal functioning in this classroom?

   1. Completely typical
   2. Reasonable approximation
   3. Atypical. Explain________________________________________

6. What amount of planning and organization was evident in this lesson?

   1. Exceptionally well organized and planned.
   2. Well organized and planned but not exceptionally so.
   3. Well organized and showed some evidence of planning.
   4. Not organized but showed some signs of previous teacher planning.
   5. Showed few or no signs of organization or planning.

7. Level of creativity and imagination evident in this lesson.

   1. Extremely creative
   2. Predominately creative
   3. Equally creative and stereotyped
   4. More stereotyped than creative
   5. Extremely stereotyped

8. If you rated this lesson as "extremely" or "predominantly creative", please explain. ________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

9. Use of the children's background and experiences evident in this lesson?

   1. Consistent opportunities for children to relate the lesson to their own background.
   2. Consistent opportunities for children to bring their experiences to the lesson.
   3. Some opportunity for the children to bring their experiences to the lesson.
   4. Some opportunity for the children to relate the lesson to their own background.
   5. Lesson was remote from the children's background and/or experiences.
   8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________________________

10. To what extent and how effectively were teaching aids utilized?

    1. Wide variety used and used creatively and effectively.
    2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively.
    3. Some used and used creatively and effectively.
    4. Some used but not particularly effectively.
    5. Little or no use of teaching aids.
    8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________

11. To what extent did this lesson refer to earlier material?

    1. Considerable reference to previous lessons.
    2. Some reference to previous lessons.
    3. No reference to previous lessons.
    8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________

12. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for future lessons?

    1. Considerable possibility for continuity.
    2. Some opportunity for continuity.
    3. Little or no possibility for continuity.
    8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________

13. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for independent work?

    1. Considerable possibility for independent work.
    2. Some opportunity for independent work.
    3. Little or no possibility for independent work.
    8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________

14. Was ability grouping employed?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________

15. Was the teaching unit formed of children from various classes within the grade?

    1. Yes
    2. No
    8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________

16. How would you rate the amount of material covered?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

17. How would you rate the depth of instruction?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor
8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

18. Had this lesson been duplicated with a class size of 30-35, what would have happened to its effectiveness?

1. Larger class size would have completely destroyed its effectiveness.
2. Larger class size would have seriously impaired its effectiveness.
3. Lesson would have been somewhat less effective in a larger class.
4. There would have been no loss of effectiveness.

19. How many children showed interest and enthusiasm?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. Half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Very few or no children.
8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

20. How many children volunteered in response to teacher questions?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. Half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Very few or no children.
8. Not relevant. Explain: ______________________________

21. How many children raised questions?

1. Every or almost every child.
2. More than half the children.
3. About half the children.
4. Fewer than half the children.
5. Very few or no children.
8. Not relevant. Explain: ______

22. How would you describe the teacher's overall handling of the children's questions?

1. Questions were welcomed and built on.
2. Questions were answered cursorily.
3. Questions were ignored.
4. Opportunity for questions was there but few or none were asked. Why? ______
8. Not relevant. Explain: ______

23. What was the overall participation of children?

1. Every or almost every child was actively involved.
2. More than half participated.
3. About half participated.
4. Fewer than half participated.
5. Very few or none participated.
8. Not relevant. Explain: ______

24. What was the children's general understanding of the teacher's spoken word?

1. Every or almost every child understood fully.
2. More than half understood.
3. About half the children understood fully.
4. Fewer than half the children understood.
5. Very few or no children understood.

25. How would you describe the overall verbal fluency of the children who participated?

1. Articulated clearly with correct grammar.
2. Articulated clearly with some grammatical errors.
3. Articulated clearly with many grammatical errors.
4. Articulated indistinctly with correct grammar.
5. Articulated indistinctly with some grammatical errors.
6. Articulated indistinctly with many grammatical errors.
8. Not relevant. Explain: ______

26. How would you describe the verbal communication among the children?

1. Articulated clearly with correct grammar.
2. Articulated clearly with some grammatical errors.
3. Articulated clearly with many grammatical errors.
4. Articulated indistinctly with correct grammar.
5. Articulated indistinctly with some grammatical errors.
6. Articulated indistinctly with many grammatical errors.
8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________

27. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with the children?

1. Always or almost always spoke to the children on their level of understanding.
2. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding more than half the time.
3. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding about half the time.
4. Spoke to the children on their level of understanding less than half the time.
5. Seldom or never spoke to the children on their level of understanding.

28. How would you describe the teacher's verbal communication with Non-English speaking children?

1. Communicates with ease.
2. Communicates with some difficulty.
3. Communicates with great difficulty.
8. Not relevant. Explain: ____________________

29. How would you describe the overall relationship among the children?

1. All or almost all the children seem to get along well with others as a total class.
2. All or almost all the children seem to get along well with some of the others with evidence of small social cliques.
3. More than half of the children seem to get along well with others.
4. About half the children seem to get along well with others.
5. Fewer than half the children seem to get along well with others.
6. Very few or no children seem to get along well with others.

30. How would you describe the overall Teacher-Pupil relationship?

1. Teacher seems to get along well with all or almost all the pupils.
2. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, ignoring the rest.
3. Teacher seems to get along well with more than half the pupils, and shows an overt distaste for some.
4. Teacher seems to get along well with about half the pupils.
5. Teacher seems to get along well with fewer than half the pupils.
6. Teacher seems to get along well with very few or none of the pupils.

31. How would you rate the overall quality of instruction?

1. Outstanding
2. Better than average
3. Average
4. Below average
5. Extremely poor

32. How would you rate the classroom's appearance?

1. Extremely attractive
2. Of greater than average attractiveness
3. Average
4. Less than average attractiveness
5. Unattractive

Additional observation ________________________________________

________________________________________________________

33. How would you describe the classroom atmosphere in terms of discipline and in terms of warmth?

1. Undisciplined and warm
2. Undisciplined and cold
3. Disciplined yet congenial or warm
4. Disciplined and cold
5. Overdisciplined yet warm
6. Overdisciplined and cold

**Additional Comments:**

# CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
## Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program
## Student Self-Image Inventory

The questions on the attached sheets are asked to find out what you think about yourself and to help you learn about yourself. You are to look at yourself and decide what your strong points and weak points are. Think carefully before answering and check the statements which best describe your thoughts and feelings.

Your responses will be valuable in helping your teachers and others to plan the kinds of experiences which will help you most.

The first questions are divided into three groups.

Group I: Check the feeling which best describes how you feel.

Group II: Check whether you think you will make some improvement, or whether you probably won't.

Group III: Check how you feel you compare to other pupils in your class.

## CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

## MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS EVALUATION - 1968 STUDENT SELF-IMAGE INVENTORY

| | Group 1 | | | | Group 2 | | Group 3 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MY PRESENT CHARACTERISTICS AND HOW I FEEL ABOUT THEM | | | | PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT | | COMPARED TO MY CLASSMATES HOW DO I RATE MYSELF? | | | |
| | Strongly like | Mildly like | Mildly Dis-like | Strongly Dislike | I think I may make improvement | I probably won't make any improvement | Very good | Better than a good many | Average | Not very good |
| 1. My size | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2. My looks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3. My ability in things that require physical skill | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 4. My personal neatness and cleanliness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 5. The way I dress | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 6. My ability to get along with adults | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 7. My ability to help others | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8. My ability to get along with other children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9. My manners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 10. My grades | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

| | Group 1 | | | | Group 2 | | Group 3 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MY PRESENT CHARACTERISTICS AND HOW I FEEL ABOUT THEM | | | | PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT | | COMPARED TO MY CLASSMATES HOW DO I RATE MYSELF? | | | |
| | Strongly like | Mildly like | Mildly Dis-like | Strongly Dislike | I think I may make improvement | I probably won't make any improvement | Very good | Better than a good many | Average | Not very good |
| 11. My school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 12. My ability to get along well with my teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 13. My participation in school activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 14. My ability to study | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 15. My ability to have fun | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 16. My ability to make friends in school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 17. My ability to read | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 18. My ability to do arithmetic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 19. My ability to do things by myself | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 20. My recreational activities (vacations, picnics parties, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 21. My neighborhood | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | XXXXXX | XXXXXX | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

Below are listed some areas of work which you might well be engaged in after you finish your education. If there is an area not listed which you would like to add please do so. Check the columns to show THE WORK YOU WOULD LIKE TO DO, THE WORK YOU THINK YOUR PARENTS WANT YOU TO DO, and THE WORK YOU THINK YOU WILL ACTUALLY BE DOING when you finish your education. (Check one in each column.)

| | Work I Would Like To Do | Work My Parents Want Me To Do | Work I Think I Will Actually Do |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Clerical or Sales Work** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Law** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Politics** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Skilled Trades** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Sports** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **City Transit Work** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Teaching** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Nursing** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Service Work** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

| | Work I Would Like To Do | Work My Parents Want Me To Do | Work I Think I Will Actually Do |
|---|---|---|---|
| Civil Service | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Medicine | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Mathematics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Chemistry | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Physics | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Biology | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Art | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Music | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Own Business | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ________ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ________ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ________ | 1 | 2 | 3 |

On the following pages are some statements which are frequently made about schools, education, and people. Please check the appropriate column to indicate whether you agree or disagree with each statement or have no opinion.

| | I strongly agree | I agree | I have no opinion | I disagree | I strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. More Negro teachers should be hired to work in schools where most pupils are Negro. | | | | | |
| 2. The N. Y. Board of Education is sincere about wanting to integrate schools. | | | | | |
| 3. It is more important to improve neighborhood schools than to try to achieve full integration. | | | | | |
| 4. Any child who works hard and gets good grades can get someplace in this world. | | | | | |
| 5. Teachers spend too much time disciplining pupils and not enough time teaching. | | | | | |
| 6. Teachers here seem to feel that pupils just aren't smart enough to learn anything. | | | | | |
| 7. All pupils get a better education in racially mixed schools. | | | | | |
| 8. Academic standards are higher in schools where most of the pupils are white. | | | | | |
| 9. White students get a better education in racially mixed schools. | | | | | |
| 10. Most teachers don't like teaching in schools located in areas like Harlem. | | | | | |

| | I strongly agree | I agree | I have no opinion | I disagree | I strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Pupils who go to schools outside their neighborhood don't have enough time to be with their neighborhood friends. | | | | | |
| 12. Black students get a better education in racially mixed schools. | | | | | |
| 13. White teachers don't like teaching in schools located in areas like Harlem. | | | | | |
| 14. Even if a black child works hard and gets good grades, getting a good job will still be difficult. | | | | | |
| 15. Black teachers don't like teaching in schools located in areas like Harlem. | | | | | |
| 16. Pupils who stay in their own neighborhood seem to get along better and learn more than those who attend schools outside their neighborhood. | | | | | |

## MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS EVALUATION

### My Duties As A Specialist In An ME School

This questionnaire is designed to enable you to provide relevant information about your duties as an MES specialist.

### PART I: CURRENT DUTIES

1. In column one list your duties in this school.
2. In column two rank the duties you have listed in the order of their importance, assigning the rank of (1) to the most important duty.
3. In column three rank these same duties in order by the amount of your time they take, assigning (1) to the duty which takes most time.
4. In column four indicate whether, if you could, you would retain each duty listed in column (1).
5. In column five indicate whether, if you could, you would alter the time you spend on each duty listed in column one. Circle the "No" to indicate no change, the minus (-) to indicate less time or the plus (+) to indicate more time.
6. It has been said that, "People are less influenced by what is said than they are by who is saying it." With this possibility in mind, in column six indicate whether or not you are able to perform the duties listed in column one primarily because of the title of the position you hold.

| Col. 1 | Col. 2 | Col. 3 | Col. 4 | Col. 5 | Col. 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ranks For | | Would You Retain | Would You Alter Time | Is Duty Tied to Title |
| Duty | Importance | Time | | | |
| 1. | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 2. | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 3. | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 4. | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 5. | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 6. | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 7. | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |

### PART II: ADDITIONAL DUTIES

List below any duties you would add, if you could and indicate why you do not now perform these.

| Duties I Would Add | Why Duty is Not Now Performed |
|---|---|
| | |

Thank you for your cooperation.

## MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS EVALUATION

### The Duties Of A                In My School

Listed above is the title of a position found in your schools. This questionnaire is designed to enable you to provide relevant information about your views on the duties of this role.

As you respond to the requests below, please consider each role as you see it operating in your school.

1. In column one list the duties and responsibilities of the person filling this role in your school.
2. In column two rank those duties you have listed in the order of their importance.
3. In column three rank the duties you have listed in order by the amount of the specialist's time each takes.
4. In column four rank the duties in order by the frequency with which they bring you in contact with the specialist.
5. In column five indicate whether, if you could you would retain each duty listed in column one.
6. In column six indicate whether, if you could, you would alter the time now spent performing the duties that are listed in column one. Circle the minus (-) to indicate less time, the plus (+) to indicate more time and the (No) to indicate no change.
7. It has been said that, "People are less influenced by what is said than they are be who is saying it." With this possibility in mind, in column seven indicate which of the duties listed in column one you believe the specialist is able to perform primarily because of the title of the position held

| Col. 1 Duty | Col. 2 Ranks For Importance | Col. 3 Time | Col. 4 Contact | Col. 5 Would You Retain | Col. 6 Would You Alter Time | Col. 7 Is Duty Tied to Title |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 2. | | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 3. | | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 4. | | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 5. | | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 6. | | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |
| 7. | | | | No<br>Yes | No<br>-<br>+ | No<br>Yes |

### ADDITIONAL DUTIES

List below any duties you would add, if you could, and indicate why you think these are not performed.

| Duties I Would Add | Why Duty is Not Now Performed |
|---|---|
| | |

Thank you for your cooperation

## CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
## Evaluation of More Effective Schools

### Decision Making Study

On page two of this questionnaire is a list of decisions which frequently are made that effect you and your colleagues in this school. Certain people are typically involved in making decisions of a particular nature. Using the list of code numbers which appear at the top of page two indicate:

I. PARTICIPANTS

A. Who in your school should be involved in the decision making process.
B. Who in your school would actually be involved in the decision making process.

II. SEQUENCE OF PARTICIPATION

A. What the sequence is by which individuals should become involved in the decision making process, beginning with the person you believe should initiate the decision making process.
B. What the sequence is by which individuals would actually become involved in the decision making process.

III. DECISION MAKER

A. Who should make the actual decision.
B. Who would make the actual decision.

For example, suppose what is required is, "Deciding which doors students may use to enter the school building in the morning." One way the decision making process may be shown is:

| | | I | II | III |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DECISION | | PARTICIPANT(S) | SEQUENCE OF PARTICIPATION | DECISION MAKER(S) |
| 1. Deciding which doors students may use to enter the school building in the morning. | A | 23, 21 | 23, 21 | 23, 21 |
| | B | 23, 22, 21 | 21, 23, 22 | 21 |

An analysis of the above response reveals that the respondent believes the following:

I. PARTICIPANTS

The respondent has indicated, (on line A), his belief that the participants in the decision making process should be the administrative assistant (23) and the principal (21). But on line B the respondent has indicated in fact the participants would be the administrative assistant (23), the assistant principal (22), and the principal (21).

II. SEQUENCE OF PARTICIPATION

The sequence of participation should (line A) begin with the administrative assistant and end with the principal. However, in his school the respondent believes the decision making process would be initiated (line B) by the principal, and subsequently involve the administrative assistant and the assistant principal simultaneously; (indicated by the circle enclosing the codes for the two positions).

III. DECISION MAKER

The numbers 23 and 21 enclosed by a circle again indicate that the respondent believes that the final decision should be formulated jointly by the administrative assistant and the principal. On line B he indicates that he believes the actual decision would be made by the principal alone.

FORM I

| DECISION | | I<br>PARTICIPANT(S) | II<br>SEQUENCE OF PARTICIPATION | III<br>DECISION MAKER(S) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Deciding upon the content and format of teacher orientation program. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |
| 2. Deciding how to improve upon the development and evaluation of weekly teaching plans. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |
| 3. Deciding when it is best to remove a child from a classroom. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |
| 4. Deciding whether or not to examine controversial issues in the classroom. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |
| 5. Deciding whether or not to make guidance material available to interested parents. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |
| 6. Deciding whether or not the school shall be represented at meetings sponsored by local community groups. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Deciding how the staff of this school is to be utilized. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |
| 8. Deciding how to put teacher preparation periods to use. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |
| 9. Deciding upon the extent to which the community shall participate in school affairs. | A | | | |
| | B | | | |

## ORGANIZATION SHEET CODE

### SCHOOL POLICY MAKERS

10 N. Y. C. Board of Education
11 Superintendent of Schools
12 Local Board of Education
13 District School Superintendent

### SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY STAFF

21 Principal
22 Assistant Principal
23 Administrative Assistant
24 School Secretary
25 Custodial Staff
26 Kitchen Manager or Dietician

### PUPIL SERVICE STAFF

50 Dentist
51 Doctor
52 School Nurse
53 Guidance Counselor
54 School Psychiatrist
55 School Psychologist
56 School Social Worker

### SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONTACTS

60 Parent
61 Teacher Aid
62 Family Assistant
63 Family Worker

### SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CONTACTS (continued)

64 Interested Layman
65 Student Teacher
66 Community Social Agency
67 Educational Consultant

### TEACHING STAFF

30 Classroom Teacher
31 Art Specialist
32 Attendance Teacher
33 Audio Visual Instructor
34 Auxiliary Teacher
35 Cluster Teacher
36 Community Relations Coordinator
37 Corrective Reading Teacher
38 Health Education Teacher
39 Home Economics Teacher
40 Industrial Arts Teacher
41 Jr. Guidance Teacher
42 Language Arts Teacher
43 Librarian
44 Music Teacher
45 Reading Improvement Teacher
46 Science Teacher
47 Speech Clinician
48 Speech Teacher

## APPENDIX C - RESEARCH STAFF

Staff List:

Dr. David J. Fox, Evaluation Chairman
Professor
Dean for Research and Graduate Studies
School of Education
The City College of New York

Lorraine Flaum, Project Coordinator

Frederick A. Hill, Jr., Research Associate

Norman Shapiro, Research Associate
Lecturer
School of Education
The City College

Mrs. Naomi B. Buchheimer
Lecturer
Hunter College

Dr. Dorothy H. Cohen
Senior Staff Member
School of Education
Bank Street College of Education

Mrs. Judith Danoff
Lecturer
Department of Education
Hunter College

Dr. Harold B. Davis
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Miriam Dorn
Professor
School of Education
The City College

Valerie Barnes, Senior Research Assistant

## Appendix C - Research Staff

Dr. Richard G. Durnin
Lecturer
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Harwood Fisher
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Ruth H. Grossman
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Doris Hiller
Educational Consultant
Play Schools Association

Mrs. Frances S. Kornbluth
Supervisor Student Teaching
Mills College of Education

Dr. Lisa Kuhmerker
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College

Dr. Lorin McMackin
Associate Professor and
Department Chairman
School of Education
University of Bridgeport

Dr. Anne S. Peskin
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Gerhardt E. Rast
Professor of Education
School of Education
University of Bridgeport

Mrs. Peggy M. Schwarz
Instructor
Department of Elementary Education
The City College

Dr. Sol Schwartz
Assistant Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. James J. Shields, Jr.
Visiting Scholar
Department of Political Science
Yale University

Dr. Marvin Siegelman
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College

Dr. Martin Silverman
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College

James W. Stern
Headmaster
Columbia Grammar School

Mrs. Emmeline Weinberg
Lecturer
School of Education
The City College

Miss Brenda L. Wiggins
Evaluator, Teacher Training
St. Joseph's Head Start Center
Catholic Archdiocese of Brooklyn

Dr. Theresa A. Woodruff
Associate Professor
Department of Elementary Education
The City College